THE ARYAN GODS OF THE MITANI PEOPLE

by

Sten Konow

299.11
K82

Central BAPTIST
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

KANSAS CITY, KANSAS

KRISTIANIA ETNOGRAFISKE MUSEUMS
SKRIFTER BIND 3 HEFTE I

The Aryan Gods of the Mitani People

BY
STEN KONOW

KRISTIANIA 1921
A. W. BRØGGERS BOKTRYKKERI A·S

ROYAL FREDERIK UNIVERSITY

PUBLICATIONS

OF THE INDIAN INSTITUTE

I

LIBRARY
CENTRAL BAPTIST THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
KANSAS CITY, KANSAS 66102

KRISTIANIA

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/aryangodsofmitan0000sten

299.11
K82

THE ARYAN GODS OF THE MITANI PEOPLE

BY
STEN KONOW

Through the Tell-el-Amarna tablets and the discoveries at Boghaz Keui we have become acquainted with the history of an old people called Mitani, who held sway in Mesopotamia, on the upper Euphrates, in the fifteenth and fourteenth centuries B.C. and were finally brought into subjection by the Hittites. We know the names of several Mitani kings, Sa-uš-ša-tar, Artatama, Šutarna, Tušratta and Mattiuaza, and it has always been recognized that these names are Aryan, though there is nothing to show or even to make it probable that the people itself was of Indo-European stock. It has accordingly been assumed that an Aryan dynasty was ruling over an un-Aryan country, and at the present state of our knowledge it is hardly possible to arrive at any other conclusion.

We are not, on the other hand, in a position to state with confidence whether these Aryan names were Indian or "came from a dialect closely allied to Iranian but not yet exactly Iranian, i. e. a dialect which did not change *s* to *h*"[1]).

Great prominence has, in the discussion of this question, been allotted to a list of names of Mitani gods which is found in a treaty concluded in the 14th century B.C. between the Hittite king Subbiluliuma and the Mitani king Mattiuaza, which has been brought to light by the late Professor Winckler[2]. We are here told how Subbiluliuma had come to terms with Artatama, king of Harri. But Tušratta, the Mitani ruler, rose against Subbiluliuma, and the latter therefore crossed the Euphrates and invaded Tušratta's country. The Mitani were defeated, and Tušratta was killed by his own people. His son Mattiuaza then took refuge with Subbiluliuma, who installed him as king and gave him his own daughter in marriage.

The gods of the two peoples are then invoked to protect the treaty, and among the Mitani gods the following ones occur:

1 Cf. Bloomfield, American Journal of Philology, xxv, pp. 1 ff.; Eduard Meyer, Sitzungsberichte der K. Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1908, i, pp. 14 ff.; Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung, xlii, pp. 24 ff.; Jacobi, Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, 1909, pp. 721 ff., 1910, pp. 456 ff.; Oldenberg, ibidem, 1909, pp. 1095 ff.; Keith, ibidem, 1909, pp. 1100 ff., 1910, pp. 464 ff.

2 Mitteilungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft, No. 35, Dezember 1907, pp. 30 ff.

ilāni Mi-it-ra-aš-ši-il ilāni U-ru-w-na (or *A-ru-na-*) *aš-ši-el* (or-*il*) *ilu In-dar* (or *In-da-ra*) *ilāni Na-ša-at-ti-ia-an-na.*

All scholars agree in recognizing, behind these names, the well-known Indian gods Mitra, Varuṇa, Indra and the Nāsatyas. There is, on the other hand, no consensus of opinion with regard to the question whether they should be considered as purely Indian deities or as such worshipped by the ancient Aryans before their separation into two branches, an Indian and an Iranian. Most scholars favour the second alternative, only Jacobi has argued in favour of the view that we are here faced with Indian and not with Aryan gods. It is evident that the question is of importance for our valuation of the age of Vedic civilization. If Jacobi's view should prove to be correct, we should have to state a propagation of ancient Indian civilization into Mesopotamia in the 14th century B.C., and the Vedic period would consequently have to be pushed back to a more ancient date.

The question of origin is, as will be seen, analogous to that which presented itself with regard to the names of the Mitani kings, but should not be confounded with it. Even if it could be shown that the Mitani gods are Indian, that would not prove that the same was the case with the dynasty. A religious propaganda starting from India might well have influenced Aryan kings who where not Indian but Iranian or belonged to a tribe that might be described as semi-Iranian, speaking a dialect which had not yet substituted *h* for Aryan *s*.

The two problems should therefore be examined independently of each other, and in the following I shall accordingly leave the question about the nationality of the Mitani kings out of consideration and only deal with the names of the Aryan gods.

As has been repeatedly pointed out by other scholars, three of the names occurring in the list, viz. those corresponding to Vedic Mitra, Varuṇa and Nāsatya, are preceded by the plural *ilāni,* while Indra is characterized by the addition of the singular *ilu.* Professor Jacobi is certainly right in thinking that the plural *ilāni* is not here used as a plural proper but as a dual, "since the Babylonian language has no dual". In Vedic language, the names of the list should accordingly be rendered as follows, *Mitrā* (or *Mitrau*) *Varuṇau Indraḥ* and *Nāsatyau.* Every Sanskrit scholar will at once see that we have here the forms of these names which are the usual ones in the Ṛgveda. The question which we have to face is consequently whether these forms can be considered as inherited from the pre-Indian period of Aryan unity or as merely Indian.

The latter view would probably be taken by most scholars if it were not for the fact that these names occur at such a great distance from the home of Indian civilization. It therefore becomes necessary to examine the matter more closely in order to ascertain whether it is possible to assume that the gods in question existed under the same names in the Aryan period.

The first two names of the list immediately correspond to the Vedic dvandva compound *Mitrā-Varuṇau*. There cannot, however, be any doubt that the ideas covered by these names had been developed in the Aryan period.

Like most Vedic gods, Mitra and Varuṇa have usually been considered as personifications of certain natural phenomena, Mitra being mostly identified with the sun and Varuṇa with the moon or the sky. I have no intention of entering upon a discussion of the various explanations suggested from that point of view, because I am convinced that the conception of Vedic religion as a worship of nature and natural phenomena is fundamentally wrong. The Vedic Aryans no doubt saw powerful agents in the forces and occurrences that met them in nature, and these agents were not clearly separated from their manifestations. But they were not identified with them. The whole world was conceived after the analogy of human life, in accordance with the saying *yadannaḥ puruṣo bhavati tadannās tasya devatāḥ* (Rāmāyaṇa ii. 104. 15, Jāt. i, p. 423 [23]). Wherever there is a manifestation of strength or energy, we are inclined to look for an agent. Now-a-days we are, no doubt, capable of thinking in a more abstract way. We speak of power, of magnetism, of electricity, and so forth, as if we had to do with independent or semi-independent potencies. In most cases, however, even we expect to find a personal agent behind the powerful manifestation, and that is generally the case with the more primitive mind. Here in Norway, we frequently use expressions such as are common elsewhere in Europe, we say that "it is cold", "it rains", "it is thundering", but country-people, fishermen, sailors, &c. more usually state that *he* is cold, *he* rains, *he* blows, and so forth. If we were to ask who it is who does all these things, the answer might perhaps be "God", but that would certainly be an afterthought. The conception is in reality that there is some indefinite and indefinable agent who is at work, who is not clearly distinguished from his action, but who is not, nevertheless, identical with it.

In Vedic India we find clear traces of a similar attitude of mind. We have quite a series of abstract deities such as *Savitṛ, Dhātṛ, Trātṛ, Manyu, Kāma, Puraṃdhi, Nirṛti,* and so forth[1]. It has not, however, been fully appreciated how the conception even of the great Vedic gods is based on exactly this way of looking on the world and on nature. Agni is not only fire, but also the mighty agent who manifests himself through fire, Indra is not a personification of any phenomenon of nature, but the demon of strength and vigour whose name naturally presented itself at every manifestation of superhuman force and power, and so on.

With regard to Mitra and Varuṇa, Meillet has shown the way towards a correct explanation[2]. Mitra is the guardian of friendship and treaties, the agent who is at work at

1 Cf. Hermann Oldenberg, Die Religion des Veda, 2nd edition, Stuttgart und Berlin 1917, pp. 60 ff.

2 Journal Asiatique, 10ème série, T. x, 1907, pp. 143 ff.; cf. also Herbert Petersson, Studier tillegnade Esaias Tegnér den 13 januari 1918, Lund 1918, pp. 223 ff.

the concluding of compacts, and Varuṇa it is who watches over oaths, ordeals and solemn verbal undertakings. Mitra as well as Varuṇa no doubt go back into pre-Indian times, when the Aryans had not yet separated. I agree with Lüders[1] that these two gods had come to be considered as the guardians of law and royalty in the period of Aryan unity, and that the circle of ideas connected with them presupposes a strongly developed Aryan state. Gods such as Mitra and Varuṇa would not have been designated as kings *(rājānā)* or paramount sovereigns *(samrājā)*, or, as is the case with the Iranian Miθra, as overlords of all provinces *(vīspaṇąm daẖyuṇąm daiṅhupaitīm)*, unless a strong royal power had already been established under rulers who held sway over a large territory, probably with subordinate kings and petty chiefs as dependents and feudatories. The idea of *ṛta*, which is common Aryan and certainly pre-Indian, can only have developed in a state with well-established order.

Mitra and Varuṇa are certainly Aryan gods, and they have probably been worshipped together, as a divine couple, in the pre-Indian period. We may even assert that their names have been coupled in an old dvanda compound. The question is only whether these designations had the same form in the times of Aryan unity as in the Vedas and in the Mitani treaty. That does not, however, seem to have been the case.

It is a well-known fact that the name Varuṇa does not occur in Iranian sources, but that the Indian god is, on the other hand, certainly identical with the great Iranian Ahura. In India the corresponding word *asura* is frequently used as a designation of ancient gods, and especially of Varuṇa. We must infer from this state of things, either that the name Varuṇa has been developed on Indian soil, or else that it has been lost with the Iranians.

The dvandva-compound *Mitrā-Varuṇau*, which must be inferred from the Mitani-list, is likewise only known from the Vedas. There is, it is true, a similar divine couple in the Avesta, where the names of Miθra and Ahura are combined in a dvandva compound, *Ahura-Miθra* or *Miθra-Ahura*. But this couple cannot be formally compared and identified with the dvandva *Mitrā-Varuṇau* of the Mitani list and the Vedic texts. The order of precedence between the two names of the compound is invariable in the Vedas, and the same state of things is apparently reflected in the Mitani list. In the Avesta, on the other hand, the position of the two members is freer. Miθra occurs as the first member of the compound in two, but as the second one in six places[2], that is to say, the usual order is apparently exactly the opposite one to that which we find in the Ṛgveda and in the Mitani list. Moreover we cannot overlook the fact that the Iranian compound does not contain the name Varuṇa but replaces it with Ahura as in such instances where the name of the god occurs alone, without being coupled with that of Miθra.

[1] Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1917, pp. 372 ff.

[2] Cf. Bartholomae, Beiträge zur Kunde der indogermanischen Sprachen, x, pp. 267 f.

So far as I can see, the only natural inference from the existing state of things is that the two gods in question were worshipped as a divine couple in the ancient Aryan period, and that the dual sphere of action represented by them had found its expression in the formation of a dual compound comprising the names of both gods, that, however, the arrangement of the order between the two members of this compound was originally free. It was only on Indian soil that the order became stereotype and that the second god was called Varuṇa.

I fully admit, however, that it is impossible to arrive at certain conclusions from a consideration of the two names heading the Mitani list. We must try whether we can get further by an examination of the third name, that of *Indara* or *Indar*, which clearly corresponds to the Vedic Indra.

The state of things is here apparently somewhat similar as in the case of Mitra and Varuṇa. The name Indra occurs in the Avesta as well as in the Vedas, but only the Indian Indra presents features which explain how his name has been included in the Mitani list. The Indara invoked in the treaty must have been a powerful god, and that is the case with the Indian Indra, while in the Avesta he is only an inferior demon.

We are accordingly again faced with the same question, is the state of things met with in the Vedas inherited from the period of Indo-Iranian unity and the conceptions of the Avesta accordingly the result of a later development, or is the great god of Vedic India an Indian god, who has only been developed on Indian soil.

A priori we would no doubt be inclined to take the latter view. We can easily explain the overtowering position which Indra occupies within the Vedic pantheon out of the conditions prevailing in Vedic times.

We have seen that conceptions such as those covered by the names of Mitra and Varuṇa take us back into a period when the Aryan tribes lived under firmly established rule, when justice and right were sufficiently respected to impress the mind with the idea of eternal truth, *ṛta,* as the chief feature of divinity.

Such gods would naturally be pushed into the background in the troubled times of a big conquest, such as are reflected in the hymns of the Ṛgveda. The deities who would then become the chief objects of worship and invocation, were those who were incorporations of strength and vigour and personal valour, the demons of war and fight. That is exactly what Indra seems to have been, and that is the reason why he became, in Vedic times, the great Aryan god who was the chief protector in the fights against the aboriginal inhabitants. Ancient myths and new tales were brought into connexion with him, he became the central figure in all accounts of valorous deeds, and gradually he developed into the great god of the Vedic Aryans, to whom nearly one fourth of all the hymns of the Ṛgveda are devoted.

The conditions prevailing during the period of the Aryan conquest of India would, therefore, be especially favourable to the growth of such ideas as are the leading ones in

the Vedic conception of the god Indra, and we would *a priori* be inclined to consider him as a purely Indian god, developed within India itself, during those wars and fightings which accompanied the Aryan conquest. And we would become still more disposed to do so, if it could be shown, or made likely, that there are no certain traces of the existence of a great god Indra outside of India, and that, on the other hand, some of the chief feats ascribed to him must be localized in India. Now that is exactly what I think to be the case.

One of the commonest adjectives applied to the Vedic Indra is *vṛtrahan*, slayer of Vṛtra. I shall return to the legend connected with this designation later on, in this place we are only concerned with the fact that the same appellation is also met with on Iranian soil viz. in *Vərəθraγna*, the Avestan god of victory, who has also found his way into Armenian mythology. In the Avesta this *Vərəθraγna* is different from Indra, but it is of course possible that this state of things represents a later development. As pointed out by Jacobi[1] it is, however, "just as likely that the Indians should have fused two gods into one as that the Iranians should have split one into two. And besides the inscription names this god Indra and not Vṛtrahan." In my opinion this latter explanation is the only one which can claim to be probable. If the Vedic gods are not originally personifications of the phenomena of nature but demons of activity, the development would from the most ancient times have been the same as we can follow in the whole religious history of Indra. Within the great host of superhuman beings whose activity is manifested everywhere, some few ones become more prominent than the rest. The minor deities are merged into them, their various acts and deeds of strength and valour are transferred to them, and the result are great gods who become the centra of an ever increasing circle of tales and legends.

Some of the chief features of the Vedic Indra can without any doubt be traced back to the Aryan, or even to the Indo-European period.

His appearance is alluded to in such a way that it becomes evident that he was, more or less vaguely, conceived in human shape, with fair lips, tawny hair and beard, and of a tawny hue. He is, more than any other god, the powerful wielder of the thunderbolt, and the personification of strength and valour. The designation *śakra*, powerful, is so commonly applied to him that it has, later on, become an ordinary name of the great god. He is *śatakratu*, possessing a hundred powers; *śacīvat*, possessed of power; *śacīpati*, the lord of power; *sahiṣṭha*, the strongest one; *taras*, strong; *tura*, overpowering; *śura*, heroic, and so forth. It is even likely that some such notion is at the bottom of his name Indra, be it that this word is etymologically connected with the base *i*, *inv*; with Greek ἶνις, or with Anglosaxon *ent*, Old German *entisc*, *entrisc*, giant. At all events, he has, as the demon of strength and valour, become the great god of war and battles.

[1] JRAS. 1910, p. 458.

He is also a strong eater and drinker. Cf. Ṛgveda v. 29. 8 *trí yác chatá mahiṣáṇām ágho más trí sárāṃsi maghávā somyápāḥ*, when Maghavat ate three hundred buffaloes and drank three lakes of soma. I have never been able to read such passages without being reminded of what the Þrymskviða says about Þórr, —

einn át oxa *átta laxa*
krásir allar *þær er konor skyldo*
drakk Sifjar verr *sáld þriu mjaþar,*

he ate one ox, eight salmons, all the dainties that the women should, Sif's husband drank three firkins of mead.

There are also other features in the description of Þórr which remind us of the Vedic Indra, even if we abstract from the thunderbolt which is the weapon of both. Þórr is *þrúdugr*, strong, powerful, and slays the whole host of the demons, he has a reddish beard, and so forth, just like Indra, and his hair and beard are agitated when he gets excited. Cf. *skegg nam at hrista skǫr nam at dýja*, he started shaking his beard and his hair, Þrymskviða 1, and *pradódhuvac chmáśruṣu*, shaking in the beard, Ṛv. ii. 11. 17, *prá śmáśru dódhuvad*, shaking his beard, x. 23. 1.

There is, on the whole, a general consensus of opinion to the effect that "already the Indo-Europeans knew probably the being that has developed into the Vedic Indra: an overpowerful hero, god or giant, with tawny or red beard, a big eater and drinker, the victorious killer of the dragon[1]." In other words, the conception of a demon or god of strength and vigour was familiar in the Indo-European period, and his features had already been filled in from the store of ancient folklore which is as old as the oldest mythology.

I think that we can safely assume as much as that. But it is impossible to state which or how many myths had, in this way, been brought together under one head. We are justified in concluding that the ancient Indo-Europeans, like the old Indian Aryans, looked for an agent behind feats and manifestations of extraordinary strength and valour and that this agent was made responsible for such heroic deeds as were related in their old folk-tales.

On the other hand, there is not the slightest indication to show that this demon or god of strength had already a proper name. It is more likely that he was vaguely designated as "the strong one", a designation which can still be traced in epithets such as Old Norse *þrúdugr*, Indian *sahasvat*, *tura*, *śakra* and perhaps even in the name *Indra* itself. And we have no right to assume that such a demon, who may, in the Aryan period, have been called Indra, had already developed into a great and powerful god. And only such a god can have been in the mind of those who drew up the list in the Mitani treaty.

[1] See Oldenberg, loc. cit., p. 132.

I have already stated that the events during the Aryan conquest of India would naturally lead to such a development of the ancient demon of strength into a god who might easily become the foremost amongst the deities worshipped by the Aryans, because he was pre-eminently capable of granting them the protection they needed in fighting their enemies. And that such has actually been the case, becomes exceedingly probable when we consider the ancient myths connected with Indra. Many of them must be localized in India, and occasionally there are indications to show that Indra has sometimes replaced other agents as the perpetrator of valorous deeds. The natural inference is that the great god Indra, the king of gods, is of Indian growth, and, consequently, that the Indra of the Mitani list was an Indian god.

Indra's principal feat is, as is well known, the slaying of Vṛtra and the setting free of the waters. Vṛtra is commonly characterized as *ahi*, serpent or dragon, and there cannot well be any doubt that Indra's fight with Vṛtra has some connexion with numerous other traditions and tales about the slaying of a dragon or serpent by a valiant hero. The Avestan Vərəθraγna no doubt belongs to this class, though we do not any more possess corresponding tales about him. Other slayers of dragons are the Armenian Vahagn, the Norse Sigurd who killed the serpent Fáfnir and acquired the hidden gold, Herakles who killed the Hydra, St. George who slew the dragon, and so forth. It seems safe to infer that some such tale belonged to the oldest strata of Indo-European lore.

It is commonly believed that such tales are old myths built up over the background of natural phenomena, and such an explanation sometimes naturally presents itself. That need not, however, mean that it is throughout the right one. It is just as conceivable that speculations about such phenomena have been clothed in the garb of ancient folk-tales. Here, as in so many other cases, we would do well in being careful before we consider the ideas met with in folk-lore as residua of ancient myths. Not infrequently we may ultimately arrive at the result that the folk-tales are older, more original, than the myths and have contributed towards the development and growth of the latter ones.

I feel convinced that such is the case with regard to the original conception of the serpent or dragon whom a strong person conquers and robs of his wealth. The belief in such beings must have been firmly rooted in the popular mind, long before mythology made use of them as poetical embellishments in cosmic myths. The original conception was probably more of the same kind as the ideas prevailing among the people where I have myself grown up and whose beliefs I have shared. Hidden treasures were to be found in the hills and woods, and treacherous snakes or serpents jealously watched over them. He who could manage to find the hiding place and kill the serpent, or at least throw steel over the hidden wealth, would become master of the treasures. When a child I never went into the woods or hills without carrying some steel with me for such purposes.

It is, however, of little use for my present purpose to enter further upon such guesses. The great variety in the names of the persons who achieved the great feat of slaying the serpent or dragon, sufficiently shows the floating character of these tales. They belonged to ancient folk-lore, and it was natural to ascribe them to such heroes or demons as were conceived as paragons of valour and courage, in the north to Þórr, in Greece to Herakles and in India to Indra. We cannot, however, from such a state of things draw the conclusion that Þórr, Herakles and Indra are merely different names of one and the same person, who had already individual features in the Indo-European period. It would be more natural to infer from the correspondence between Indian Vṛtrahan, Avestan Vərə-Þraγna, Armenian Vahagn that the slayer of the serpent was originally designated simply as the performer of that feat and had no proper name of his own, just as in Vedic India Savitṛ, the instigator, Dhātṛ, the creator, Trātṛ, the protector, are characterized as the performers of the activity covered by their appellations, but have not got any individual names.

The result of the slaying of the serpent is not the same in every mythology, and we can safely infer that it was not clearly defined in the original folk-tales. In different countries the ancient tradition about the dragon or serpent was made use of in different myths, and these latter ones generally have a local character. That is the case with the tale about the treasures that were taken away after Fáfnir had been killed, and I think we can say the same with regard to the setting free of the waters in the Indra legend. I am of course aware of the fact that it has been explained in quite a different way by most scholars. Some think of the beneficial rains that make an end to the period of drought and darkness, while other ones are of opinion that the original myth symbolizes how the god of sun and summer slays the demon of winter and ice. But I am unable to adopt any such view.

The leading features of the Vṛtra-myth have been well summarized by the late Professor Oldenberg[1]: a god fights a serpent-like demon and opens up the interior of the mountains; the waters of the rivers break forth and flow on towards the ocean.

It has been repeatedly pointed out by other scholars that there is rarely, in this connexion, any mention of rain, and the natural inference would be that Indra is not a rain-giving god, or, say, the demon of the monsoon. The mountains have, it is true, been held to signify clouds or darkness, and the rivers to mean rain or light. Oldenberg is, however, certainly right in maintaining that the Vedic poets thought of real mountains and real rivers. It is here of comparatively small interest to examine whether the Indian myth can be shown to have its roots also in pre-Indian traditions meant to symbolize natural phenomena such as thunderstorms or the revolutions of spring in northern climates, or whether the supposed *apvurta* instead of *apaoša* of the Avesta Vulgata points back to an

[1] loc. cit. p. 137.

old Aryan myth about a demon who shuts up the waters. In the first place, there is no trace of the name Indra in connexion with such conceptions outside of India, and, secondly, the most important point to settle is not the question about such possible parallels, but the possibility or necessity of localizing the Vedic myth in India.

Hillebrandt[1] has carefully analysed the terminology commonly used in describing the victory over Vṛtra and its consequences, and he arrives at the result that "the demon who surrounds the rivers, who lies on the streams or mountains, handless and footless, who shuts up, covers, chains, binds the waters, whom Indra with his thunderbolt pierces in his sleep, is no phenomenon that is intelligible on Indian soil or has its analogon in the language of the poets".

I am unable to admit the correctness of this argument, which Professor Hillebrandt tries to support by quotations from classical Indian poets. So far as I can see, there is nothing in the Vedic Vṛtra-myth that leads us to think of any country outside of India. If we abstract from the ancient legend about the serpent and the hero who slays him, which belongs to the circle of ancient Indo-European folk-lore, every feature of the myth points towards India.

Oldenberg has drawn attention to the enormous importance which the Panjab rivers have for the possibilities of life, and this fact alone goes a long way towards making it probable that the Vedic tale about Indra's victory over Vṛtra and his setting the pent up rivers free, has been developed in the Panjab. We must not, moreover, forget that the names of the rivers usually mentioned in this connexion likewise point in that same direction. It is absolutely superfluous to go into details in order to show that. It is quite sufficient to remind the reader of the famous hymn to the Panjab rivers Vipāś and Śutudrī iii. 33, where these rivers are designated as prompted by Indra (*Indreṣite*, v. 2), and where we hear that Indra broke way for them in killing Vṛtra (*Índro asmā̃ aradad vájrabāhur ápāhan Vṛtráṃ paridhíṃ nadīnām*, v. 6).

The climatic conditions of the Panjab at the present day are mainly in accordance with the state of things which can be inferred from the Vṛtra myth. To quote the Imperial Gazetteer of India (Vol. xx, pp. 246 ff.), "all the seven great rivers of the Punjab rise in the Himalayas, and after long courses, sometimes of several hundred miles, amid snow-clad ranges, they debouch on the plains . . . In the winter the streams are comparatively small; but as the mountain snows melt at the approach of the hot season, the waters rise and overflow the surrounding country, often to a distance of several miles on either side. At the close of the rainy season the waters recede, leaving wide expanses of fertile loam or less fertile sand . . . As a whole, the Punjab has in normal years two well-defined rainy seasons. The first or period of the north-east monsoon includes the 'Christmas rains' as they are called, which fall between the end of December and the end of February or

[1] Vedische Mythologie, iii, pp. 162 ff.

the middle of March. The second rainfall period is that of the south-west monsoon, from the end of June to the middle of September. The rainfall is naturally heaviest in the Himālayas . . . In the plains the rainfall decreases rapidly away from the hills. The submontane zone, which skirts the foot of the hills, and of which Rāwalpindi and Siālkot may be taken as typical stations, has an annual fall of 30 to 40 inches. The eastern plains from Delhi to Lahore belong to the West Gangetic plain, and have a mean rainfall of about 24 inches, the valley of the Jumna having a higher rainfall than the rest. To the west and south-west lies the dry area, characterized by an extremely light and variable rainfall, and a heat and dryness in the hot season extreme even for the Punjab. The ordinary south-west monsoon winds from the Sind and Kāthiāwār coasts encircle but do not blow into this area, which therefore gets very little rain from this source, though it occasionally receives heavy cyclonic downpours from storms that have travelled westward from the head of the Bay. Montgomery and Multān are typical stations of this tract . . . About the end of December the weather conditions ordinarily become disturbed; rain falls in the plains and snow on the hills. The rainfall of this season is almost exclusively due to cold-season storms or cyclones, which follow each other at varying intervals, averaging about ten days from the end of December to about the middle of March . . . As the rainfall of this period accompanies the march of cyclonic storms from west to east across Northern India, it is ordinarily heaviest at the Northern and Indus valley stations, and usually diminishes to a very small amount over the south and south-east. The mean temperature in most parts increases from February to May at about the rate of 10 a month, and by the end of March or beginning of April the hot season is in most years fairly established."

Under such conditions as prevail in the Panjab, it would not be natural to ascribe the annual increase in the bulk of the rivers to the activity of the rains. The rainfall is, over a large area, too scanty to account for it, and, moreover, the great rise in the rivers takes place before the proper rains set in. Those who are unaware of the influence exercised by the melting of the snows in the high hills, as the Vedic Aryans probably were, would rather arrive at the conclusion that the waters were in some way hemmed in behind the mountains, but released in the period preceding the summer floods. That is just the time of storms and cyclones, that may "bring fogs that are not blown away, even in the desert" (*dhánvañ cid á rudríyasaḥ míhaṃ kṛṇvanty avátām*, Ṛv. i. 38. 7). In this connexion it is perhaps worth while remembering the fact that the Brahmaṇas frequently describe summer as Indra's season[1].

So far as I can see, the Vedic Vṛtra-myth is exactly what we should expect if it had been framed in the Panjab. I do not deny that it may have older pre-Indian roots in

[1] Cf. Hillebrandt, loc. cit., iii, p. 212.

Aryan or even Indo-European conceptions. As we find it in the Ṛgveda, however, it takes us to the Panjab.

In such circumstances, we have no right to consider the god Indra who slays Vṛtra as a pre-Indian god or demon. The ancient popular tales about serpents and their slayers have been adapted so as to suit the peculiar conditions of the Panjab, and in thus localizing them, the name of Indra would naturally present itself to the mind. For he, the great hero and valiant protector of the Aryans, was pre-eminently fitted for such feats of strength and valour. In other words, the Vedic story about the slaying of Vṛtra and the deliverance of the waters, is Indian, and Indra can only have come to play his role in it on Indian soil.

If we assume, as I think we must, that the Indra-Vṛtra myth is of Indian growth, and, at the same time, bear in mind that the slaying of Vṛtra is the chief feat of the Vedic Indra, it follows that the pre-Indian Indra cannot have been a god of the same magnitude as the mighty deity who is praised in so many hymns of the Ṛgveda.

If we turn to other parts of the Indra-legend, we shall throughout find the same state of things. What is told about Indra, takes us to India, or else there are indications that Indra's name has only been brought into the tale at a later date, after he had become the typical perpetrator of powerful acts.

Another great deed of the Vedic Indra which is frequently praised, is his victory over the Paṇis and the consequent recovery of the cows by the Aryans. All the details will be found in the various standard works on Vedic religion and mythology. The explanations of the old tale suggested by various scholars differ very much from each other, and none of them sufficiently accounts for every detail. It is evident that myths and poetical lore have wound a garland of multifarious conceptions around an old kernel, and it is possible that more than one old tradition has been utilized.

Oldenberg[1] is no doubt right in assuming that some leading features of the myth carry us back into a very remote past, perhaps even into the Indo-European period: some powerful agent recovers the cows after killing a three-headed monster. In addition to this, Oldenberg thinks he can trace another myth, to which he ascribes a prominently Indian character. Here the cows were guarded by the so-called Paṇis and released by Indra.

I agree with Oldenberg in thinking that this story has been arranged and put into shape in India. But I believe that there is an older kernel that takes us back into pre-Indian times. The Paṇis are, as is well known, brought into connexion with the mythical river Rasā, and I have no doubt that those scholars are right who maintain that Rasā is an old name of the Volga, corresponding to Mordvine Rau and Ptolemy's Rha. I think that we have sufficient reason for assuming an old substratum underneath the Vedic tale, which dates from the days when nomadic Aryans went with their herds as far as the Volga. Beyond that river, on the elevated right-hand riverbank, were the strongholds of

[1] loc. cit. pp. 141 ff.

the Paṇis, and I agree with Hillebrandt that some ethnic name is probably contained in this word, though I think it little convincing when he identifies the Paṇis with the Parnoi, whom we find settled in Arachosia in later times. That the Aryans must in very early times have extended as far as the Volga, or at all events into the immediate neighbourhood of Finno-Ugrian peoples, is, as is well known, also evident from the ancient Aryan loan-words in Mordvine and other connected languages.

I also agree with Oldenberg in thinking that the ancient tale partly has grown up out of the desire to explain how men have got into possession of such valuable objects as cows. But such considerations are of little avail in the present connexion. What we must try to find out is whether a supernatural being named Indra played a role in these tales in pre-Indian times.

So far as I can see, it is almost impossible to assume that such has been the case. In the Avesta it is Þraetaona who kills the three-headed serpent and Miþra who releases the cows, and in the Greek myth it is Herakles who slays Geryones and takes his cows away. It is the same state of affairs as in the case of other popular tales, in every country the hero is a different person, and everywhere he is identified with some agent who, in the folk-lore of the individual people, has such features as are especially appropriate.

In India, Indra's name naturally presented itself, but Oldenberg has shown that there are indications which show that his connexion with the tale, even in India, was perhaps a later development, Indra having possibly replaced another agent, Trita Āptya. Who this Trita Āptya was, we know not. I have not, however, much hesitation in thinking that he is a personality belonging to the sphere of ancient folk-lore. There are numerous folk-tales about three brothers, the youngest of whom proves to be more capable than the other ones, who have been in the habit of looking down upon him with contempt. The word Trita itself seems to mean "third", and a Dvita occurs together with Trita in the Ṛgveda, while the Brahmaṇas also add an Ekata. In the Avesta Þrita is the third man who prepared haoma, and on his expedition against Azi dahāka, Þraetaona is accompanied by two brothers who try to slay him on the way. Everywhere we are here in the realm of folk-lore and fairy-tales, and the myth of the recovering of the cows is no doubt such a story. At all events, Indra's connexion with the myth is scarcely older than the Indian period of Aryan civilization.

In the myths which we have hitherto been considering, we could, as it were, watch the growth of the god Indra on Indian soil, Indian legends being connected with his name or other heroes being replaced by him. The same result ensues from an examination of other tales of the Indra-legend.

In numerous passages Indra is represented as fighting against enemies who are designated as *dasyus* or *dāsas*. In my opinion Oldenberg is no doubt right in stating[1] that these

[1] loc. cit. p. 149.

terms are the regular denominations which the Vedic Aryans used to denote the dark-skinned aborigines of India. If that could be proved to be the case, it would follow that almost every story connected with Indra's name is of Indian origin, and Indra could not have been a great king of gods before the Aryans entered India.

There is not, however, any consensus about the Vedic significance of the terms *dasyu* and *dāsa*. They both go back into pre-Indian times and probably from the beginning denoted inimical tribes with whom the ancient Aryans came into contact. If Oldenberg's view is right, they must therefore in India have changed their original meaning and become designations of the non-Aryan enemies of the Aryan Indians within India.

Ludwig[1] derives both names from one and the same base and thinks that the original meaning was "destroyer", and then "enemy, foe". Hillebrandt is, however, no doubt right in insisting[2] on the original ethnic sense of the word *dāsa*, and I agree with Oldenberg[3] in maintaining that the word *dasyu* has a similar origin. That *dāsa* later on gets the meaning "slave", is no more to be wondered at than the development of the corresponding English word, which had also from the beginning an ethnic sense.

This meaning of the word is already found in the Ṛgveda. Cf. *uṣas tám aśyāṃ yaśásaṃ suvíraṃ dāsápravargaṃ rayíṃ áśvabudhyam*, might I, o Uṣas, obtain that glorious wealth, rich in progeny, abounding in slaves, noticeable through horses, i. 92. 8. The translation is very uncertain. The preceding stanza is perhaps the best commentary *(prajā́vato nṛváto áśvabudhyān góagrān vā́jān*, where *prajā́vato* corresponds to *suvíraṃ*, *nṛváto* to *dāsápravargaṃ)*. Cf. further *utá dāsā́ parivíṣe smáddiṣṭi góparṇasā Yádus Turvā́ś ca māmahe*, and as slaves to serve him, with his orders, rich in cows, Yadu and Turva gave gifts, x. 62. 10; *śatáṃ me gardabhā́nāṃ ṣatám ūrṇāvatīnām śatáṃ dāsā́ áti srájaḥ*, hundred asses for me, hundred sheep, hundred slaves, and, besides, garlands, viii. 56. 3. The original meaning is still noticeable, especially in the last passage.

The meaning "slave" is probably also contained in the name Divodāsa. I look on this designation "God's slave" as a biruda and compare it with the later Devadāsa. In *divo* I do not find the meaning "heaven" but essentially the same thing as *deva*.

The meaning of Avestan *daiṅhu*, country, province, is also secondary, and has, I think, been satisfactorily explained by Professor Wilhelm Schulze.

I do not think that there can reasonably be any doubt about the ethnic character of the ancient terms. The question is whether they have retained their ethnic bearing and have simply been transferred to other tribes, who were the enemies of the Aryans in India.

This question has not always been answered in the affirmative. Thus Geldner remarks[4], that *dāsa*, when it does not mean "servant, slave", signifies the same thing as *dasyu*, and

[1] Der Rigveda, iii, p. 208.
[2] loc. cit. iii, pp. 268 ff.
[3] loc. cit. p. 150.
[4] Vedische Studien, iii, p. 96.

for *dasyu*, he says, we need not deviate from the later Indian dictionaries which give the meaning "enemy", "robber".

Geldner is certainly right in stating that *dāsa* and *dasyu* signify one and the same thing, though they may in pre-Indian times have denoted different tribes. Ṛv. i. 103. 3 we are told that Indra destroys the *dāsa* fastnesses and throws his shaft against the *dasyu (púro vibhindánn acarad ví dāsíḥ . . . dásyave hetím asya)*; iv. 28. 3 f. Indra and Agni slay and burn the *dasyus*, put down the *dasyus*, take the fame away from the *dāsa* settlements and oppress the enemies, and v. 30. 9; x. 22. 8 *dasyu* and *dāsa* are interchangeable terms. Similarly, as pointed out by Hillebrandt[1], the *dāsas* Cumuri and Dhuni are also called *dasyus*, and both terms are used to denote Śambara, Śuṣṇa and others.

On the other hand, I am unable to follow Geldner in his statement about the meaning of the word *dasyu* in the Vedas. The ethnic signification is, so far as I can see, still present to the mind of the Vedic poet. That follows, I think, with certainty from the frequency with which the *dasyus* and *dāsas* are put into contrast with the Aryans.

Indra is asked to distinguish between ārya and dasyu (*ví jānīhy áryān yé ca dásyavo*, i. 51. 8); he breaks the fastnesses of the dāsa, throws his shaft against the dasyu and increases the strength and glory of the ārya (*púro vibhindánn acarad ví dāsíḥ vidvān vajrin dásyave hetím asyāryaṃ sáho vardhaya dyumnám Indra*, i. 103, 3); the Aśvins blow against the dasyu and provide broad light for the ārya (*abhí dásyuṃ bákureṇā dhámantorú jyótiś cakrathur āryāya*, i. 117. 21); Indra uncovers the light for the ārya, and the dasyu sinks down to the left (*apāvṛṇor jyótir āryāya ní savyatáḥ sadi dásyur Indra*, ii. 11. 18, cf. 19); he slays the dasyus and favours the Aryan colour (*hatví dásyun prāryaṃ várṇam āvat*, iii. 34. 9); he subdues the dasyus and conquers the land for the ārya (*adamāyo dásyūr ékaḥ kṛṣṭír avanor āryāya*, vi. 18. 3), and he does not betray the Aryan name to the dasyu (*ná yó rarā́ áryaṃ nama dásyave*, x. 49. 3.). Similarly Agni drives away the dasyus from their home and provides broad light for the arya (*tváṃ dásyūr ókaso Agna āja urú jyótir janáyann āryāya*, vii. 5. 6).

Dāsa is used in exactly the same way. Indra distinguishes between dāsa and ārya (*arám emi vicákaśad vicinván dasam áryam*, x. 86. 19), and every ari, be he an ārya or a dāsa, is his treasure-warder (*yásyāyaṃ víśva aryo dásaḥ śevadhipā aríḥ*, viii. 51. 9). More than once we hear about dāsa enemies as opposed to Aryan foes (*dásāny áryāṇi vṛtrá*, vi. 22. 10; *dásā vṛtraṇy āryā ca*, vi. 33. 3; *vṛtrany arya dásāni*, vi. 60. 6; *dásā ca vṛtrā aryaṇi ca*, vii. 83 1; *dasa vṛtraṇy arya*, x. 69. 6). Cf. *sahyáma dasam áryam*, might we conquer dāsa and ārya, x. 83. 1; *dásasya vā áryasya vā sanutár yavayā vadhám*, ward far off the weapon of dasa and arya, x. 102. 3; *yó no dasa aryo vā ádeva Indra yudháye cíketati*, the godless man, be he dāsa or ārya, who thinks of fighting us, Indra, x. 38. 3.

[1] loc. cit. iii, p. 275.

Usually the enemies are all dāsas. When the sun stopped its car in the midst of the sky, the ārya found a counterpoise against the dasa *(ví súryo mádhye amucad ráthaṃ divó vidád dāsáya pratimánam áryaḥ*, x. 138. 3). The Aśvins bring the comforts of the dāsa from far off *(á vahethe parākát purvír aśnántav Aśvinā íṣo dásīr*, viii. 5. 31); Indra is himself an ārya who leads the dāsa at his will *(yathāvaśáṃ nayati dasam áryaḥ*, v. 34. 6); he wards off the weapon of the dāsa from the arya on the seven rivers *(yá ṛkṣad áṃhaso mucád yó váryāt saptá síndhuṣu vádhar dāsásya tuvinṛmṇa nmamaḥ*, viii. 24. 27; cf. Oldenberg, Textkritische und exegetische Noten. Siebentes bis zehntes Buch. Berlin, 1912, p. 98); he puts down the dāsa settlements for the benefit of the ārya *(áryāya víśó 'va tarīr dāsīḥ*, vi. 25. 2); he is asked to cut down and to frustrate the strength of the dāsa *(ápi vṛśca . . . ójo dāsásya dambhaya*, viii. 40. 6), to put down the dāsa *(ní dāsáṃ śiśnatho háthaiḥ*, viii. 70. 10) and he instills fear into the dāsa *(dāsáya bhiyásaṃ dadhāti*, x. 120. 2).

These non-Aryan tribes lived in settlements *(dā́sīr víśaḥ*, ii. 11. 4; iv. 28. 4; vi. 25. 2; x. 148. 2) and had their fastnesses *(púro dā́sīḥ*, i. 103. 3; iv. 32. 10; vi. 20. 10); cf. *índraḥ purbhíd ā́tirad dásam arkaír*, Indra, the breaker of fastnesses, eclipsed the dāsa with rays, iii. 34. 1; *índrāgnī navatím púro dāsápatnīr adhunutam*, Indra and Agni, you shook 99 fastnesses ruled by dāsas, iii. 12. 6, and further i. 51. 5; vi. 31. 4; x. 99, 7.

Dasyus and dāsas are, as we have seen, non-Aryan tribes. I agree with Geldner[1] that the *āyu* mentioned as the enemies of the dasyus are simply Aryans. Cf. *túrvanto dásyum āyávo vrataíh síkṣanto avratám*, the āyu who conquer the dasyu, who through pious works get the better of the impious one, vi. 14. 3. And the state of things is in reality not different in such cases where the dasyus and dāsas are apparently contrasted with human beings. i. 117. 21 it is said that the Aśvins "sowing barley with the vṛka, wonderful, milking refreshment for man, blowing against the dasyu with the bakura, provided broad light for the ārya" (*yávaṃ vṛkenāśvinā vápantéṣaṃ duhántā mánuṣāya dasrā abhí dásyum bákureṇā dhámantorú jyótiś cakrathur áryāya)*, and here the terms *manuṣa* and *ārya* are evidently interchangeable. Also elsewhere, where similar terms are used to denote the enemies of the dasyus, they should be interpreted in the same way. The dasyus themselves are characterized as men. Cf. *ád Agne áprṇato 'triḥ sāsahyād dásyun iṣáḥ sāsahyān nṝ́n*, might then, o Agni, Atri surpass the dasyus that do not give gifts, conquer the men for their riches, v. 7. 10. When they are characterized as *amānuṣa*, not human, that does not mean that they were not in reality human beings, any more than when modern nations in times of war are pleased to call their foes inhuman. It does not mean much more than that they are not men of the higher order, i. e. such as worship and are protected by the Aryan gods, in other words that they are not Aryans. It is characteristic that the term *amānuṣa* as applied to the dasyus occurs in connexion with such designations as are connected with sacrificial customs and rites. Thus the dasyus are character-

[1] Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft, lxxi, p. 320.

ized as having a different faith, being not human, without sacrifices and faith in the devas (*anyávratam ámānuṣam áyajvānam ádevayum*, viii. 70. 11), or as devoid of sacred works and of religious thought, having another faith and being inhuman (*akarmā́ dásyur abhí no amantúr anyávrato ámānuṣaḥ*, x. 22. 8). The stress is here laid on the difference in religion, and we can compare other designations such as *akratu*, without proper insight, vii. 6. 3; *abrahman*, without sacred words, iv. 16. 9; *ayajña*, *ayajyu*, not sacrificing, vii. 6. 3; *ayajvan*, the same, i. 33. 4; viii. 70. 11; *avṛdha*, without hymns of praise, vii. 6. 3; *avrata*, devoid of pious works, i. 51. 8; i. 175. 3; vi. 14. 3; ix. 41. 2; *aśraddha*, devoid of faith, vii. 6. 3. The adversaries of the dasyus, on the other hand, are repeatedly put into relationship with the sacrifice, as *sunvat*, pressing soma, i. 33. 7; vi. 31. 4; *suṣvi*, preparing soma, vi. 23. 2; *gṛṇat*, singing, vi. 31. 4; *stuvat*, praising i. 33. 7, wherefore the dasyus are also conquered through soma (i. 53. 4) or by the assistance of the priests (i. 33. 9).

I think we can safely infer that the dasyus are called *amānuṣa* chiefly because they were of another faith than the ārya. Only the Aryans worshipped the Aryan gods, and when the Vedic ṛṣis spoke of *mānuṣa*, men, they were chiefly thinking of the Aryans. The remaining human beings were at least foreigners, and we may compare the statement of the American school-boy according to whom George Washington was the first man. Adam did not count, because he was a foreigner.

Mānuṣa is derived from *manus*, and *manus* or *manu* are frequently contrasted with *dasyu* and *dāsa*. Cf. *codáyo Mánuṣo ráthaṃ sahā́vān dásyum avratám*, thou furtheredst the car of Manus, conquering the impious dasyu, i. 175. 3; *yébhir ní dásyuṃ mánuṣo nighóṣayo*, with which thou frustratedst the dasyu for manus, viii. 50. 8; *mánuṣa ūrdhvasaná . . . púro 'bhinad árhan dasyuhátye*, rising for manus he broke the fastnesses skilled in killing dasyus, x. 99. 7; *hantā́ dásyor mánor vṛdhā́ḥ*, slayer of the dasyu, increaser of manu, viii. 98. 6; *právan mánuṃ dásyave kar abhī́kam*, he favoured man and made front against the dasyu, ix. 92. 5.

In such passages we find *dasyu* opposed to *manu*, *manus*. *Dāsa* is used in exactly the same way; cf. *Índro urdhvó bhuvan mánuṣe . . . áva . . . śíro bharad dāsásya*, Indra rising for manus cut off the dāsa's head, ii. 20. 6; *sá vṛtrahéndraḥ kṛṣṇáyonīḥ purandaró dā́sīr airayad ví ájanayan mánave kṣā́m apáś ca*, Indra, the slayer of Vṛtra, the breaker of fastnesses, drove about the black-wombed dāsa-women, brought forward earth and water for manu, ii. 20. 7; *yé mánuṃ cakrúr úparaṃ dā́sāya*[1], who made manu superior to the dāsa, vi. 21. 11; *yán mā savó mánuṣa áha nirníja ṛ́dhak kṛṣe dā́saṃ kṛ́tvyaṃ háthaiḥ*, when manu's libation told me to get ready, then I put the crafty dasa aside with my blows, x. 49. 7.

I do not think there can be much doubt that *manu* and *manus* in such cases, as in many other passages, denote the typical Aryan man, the initiator of sacrifice, from whom the Aryans are descended.

[1] Note the form *dasa*.

The dasyus and dasas are accordingly inimical tribes whom the Aryans had to fight, and we have found a satisfactory explanation of the fact that they are occasionally stated to be *amānuṣa*, not human. The battles against them are fought on this earth, and the results of conquering them are generally of a material description. The conception is of course sometimes quite mythical. Thus we hear, in the Kutsa legend, about obtaining the sun *(svar*, iv. 16. 9: v. 14. 4; *surya*, i. 100. 18; iii. 34. 9; *suraś cakra*, iv. 16. 12), and the result of the fight is sometimes described as light, *jyotiḥ* (i. 117. 21; ii. 11. 18; vii. 5. 6). Not infrequently, however, we even here feel the substratum of facts underlying such descriptions, and we are constantly reminded of the circumstance that the language of the ancient hymns is not throughout the matter-of-fact speech of common life but often filled with poetical inspiration. Even if we read that the Aśvins (i. 117. 21) or Agni (vii. 5. 6) provide broad light *(uru jyotiḥ)* for the ārya, that means little more than to say that he finds a vent by the assistance of his gods.

The conception of dasyus and dāsas not merely as ordinary enemies but also as such as do not share the religion or the gods of the Aryans, naturally leads to their being considered more or less as fiends, as demons, and this notion of course partly underlies the use of designations such as *amānuṣa*. Thus the dāsa Varcin is called an *asura* vii. 99. 5. The dāsas who imprison the waters in i. 158. 5 are apparently quite mythical. Cf. *ná mā garan nadyò mātṛtamā dāsā́ yád ī́m súsamubdham avádhuḥ śíro yád asya Traitanó vitákṣat svayáṃ dāsá úro áṃsāv ápi gdha*, the motherly rivers did not swallow me when the dāsas put me down well constrained. When Traitana cut off his head, the dāsa himself tore his breast and shoulders. Vṛtra and other demons whom Indra conquers, are occasionally spoken of as dāsas. Thus *rápat kavír Indrārkásātau kṣā́m dāsā́yopabárhaṇīṃ kaḥ*, the kavi praised thee, O Indra, at the winning of light, thou madest the earth a cushion for the dāsa, i. 174. 7; *mámac caná te Maghavan Vyàṃso nivividhvā́ ápa hánu jaghā́na ádha níviddha úttaro babhuvā́ñ chíro dāsásya sáṃ piṇag vadhéna*, no sooner had, o Maghavan, Vyaṃsa, hurling thee down, cut off thy jaws, than thou, hurled down, gottest above and crushedst the head of the dāsa with thy weapon, iv. 18. 9; *tatakṣé sūryāya cid ókasi své vṛ́ṣā samátsu dāsásya nā́ma cit*, he chiselled even for the sun in his mansion, the bull in the fights cut even the name of the dasa, v. 33. 4; *áva kṣṇaumi dā́sasya nā́ma cit*, I will cut down even the name of the dāsa, x. 23. 2.

Also when the waters are called *dāsápatnīḥ* we naturally think of demons; cf. *dāsápatnīr áhigopā atiṣṭhan níruddhā ápaḥ paṇíneva gávaḥ*, with the dāsa as their lord, with the serpent as their guard, the waters stood confined as the cows by Paṇi, i. 32. 11; *víśvā apó ajayad dāsápatnīḥ*, he won all the waters that had the dāsa as their lord, v. 30. 5; *tvám apó ajayo dāsápatnīḥ*, thou didst win the waters that had the dāsa as their lord, viii. 96. 18. In such passages the dāsa is the demon whom Indra slew in order to release the waters.

It is, however, evident that this meaning of the word dāsa is secondary, just as the sense of the English word fiend. And usually we are quite on human ground. In fighting the dasyus or dāsas the Aryans obtain gold *(hiraṇyaya bhoga*, iii, 34. 9); horses (iii. 34. 9); cows (iii. 34. 9; v. 14. 4; x. 48. 2); fields and fertile soil (i. 100. 18; iv. 38. 1) and so forth. When Indra, the slayer of dasyus, is asked to go to somebody's cow-pen and open it *(kuvítsasya prá hí vrajáṃ gómantaṃ dasyuhá gómat śácībhir ápa no varat*, vi. 45. 24), we may even be allowed to think of predatory excursions carried out by the Aryans amongst their enemies such as are described in the story about the robbing of Virāṭa's cows in the Mahābhārata.

When we bear in mind that the dasyus and dāsas were the enemies of the Aryans and that they did not worship the Aryan gods, we easily understand that the leading Aryan gods are their chief antagonists. Thus in the case of the dasyus Indra (i. 33. 4, 7, 9; i. 51. 5, 6, 8; i. 53. 4; i. 63. 4; i. 100. 12, 18; i. 101. 5; i. 103. 3, 4; i. 104. 5; i. 175. 3; ii. 11. 18, 19; ii. 12. 10; ii. 13. 9; ii. 15. 9; iii. 34. 6, 9; iii. 49. 2; iv. 16. 9, 12; iv. 28. 3, 4; v. 29. 10; v. 30. 9; v. 31. 5, 7; vi. 18. 3; vi. 23. 2; vi. 24. 8; vi. 29. 6; vi. 31. 4; vi. 45. 24; vii. 19. 4; viii. 6. 14; viii. 14. 14; viii. 50. 8; viii. 70. 11; viii. 76. 11; viii. 77. 3; viii. 98. 6; x. 22. 8; x. 47. 4; x. 48. 2; x. 49. 3; x. 55. 8; x. 73. 5; x. 99. 7, 8; x. 105. 7, 11), Agni (i. 36. 18; i. 59. 6; i. 78. 4; iii. 29. 9; iv. 28. 3; v. 4. 6; v. 7. 10; v. 14. 4; vi. 14. 3; vi. 16. 15; vii. 5. 6; vii. 6. 3; viii. 39. 8), and Soma (ix. 41. 2; ix. 47. 2; ix. 88. 4; ix. 92. 5), who is however more frequently considered as an auxiliary who strengthens Indra for the fight. Besides we occasionally also find other gods mentioned as slayers of the dasyus, the Aśvins (i. 117. 3. 21), Varuṇa and Mitra (iv. 38. 1; v. 70. 3), and, in the tenth book, the abstract deities Manyu (x. 83. 3, 6) and Vibhrāj (x. 170. 2).

The state of things with regard to the dāsas is the same. We find Indra (i. 32. 11; i. 103. 3; i. 174. 7; ii. 11. 4; ii. 12. 4; ii. 20. 6. 7; iii. 34. 1; iv. 18. 9; iv. 28. 4; iv. 30. 14. 15, 21; iv. 32. 10; v. 30. 5, 7, 8, 9; v. 33. 4; v. 34. 6; vi. 20. 6. 10; vi. 22. 10; vi. 25. 2; vi. 26. 5; vi. 33. 3; vi. 47. 21; vii 19. 2; viii. 24. 27; viii. 32. 2; viii. 40. 6; viii. 70. 10; viii. 96. 18; x. 22. 8; x. 23. 2; x. 38. 3; x. 49. 6, 7; x. 54. 1; x. 73. 7; x. 99. 6; x. 120. 2; x. 138. 3; x. 148. 2), Indra and Agni (iii. 12. 6; vi. 60. 6), Indra and Varuṇa (vii. 83. 1), Indra and Viṣṇu (vii. 99. 4), Agni (x. 69. 6), the Aśvins (viii. 5. 31), Traitana (i. 158. 5), Manyu (x. 83. 1) and the gods in general *(devāso* i. 104. 2; *viśve yajatrāḥ* vi. 21. 11).

It is thus evidently Indra who is the chief slayer of dasyus and dāsas, and his fights against them cover a considerable part of his activity. In order to solve the question whether Indra should be considered as an Indian god, with roots in ancient Aryan and Indo-European conceptions, but only developed on Indian soil, it will accordingly be of some importance to decide what the Vedic Aryans understand under the terms dasyu and dāsa.

So far, we have only been able to state that these ancient enemies were considered as non-Aryan tribes, lying outside the pale of Aryan civilization. We have not, on the other hand, found any certain indications which allow us to localize them inside or outside of India. Several of the adjectives and nouns used to characterize them are likewise of little use in this respect.

We hear about their *māya* (e. g. i. 51. 5; i. 117. 3; iii. 34. 6; iv. 16. 9; v. 31. 7; viii. 14. 14; x. 73.5), they are described as *vṛjina* (iii. 34.6), *grathin* (vii. 6. 3) or *aśiva* (i. 117. 3). There is nothing very characteristic in any of these terms. It is only what we might expect, that the enemies of the Aryans and of the Aryan gods are described as crafty fiends.

Pischel has declared[1] that another adjective, *mṛdhravac*, which is used about *dasyus* in two passages, characterizes them as demons. I agree with Geldner[2], however, in thinking that *mṛdhravāc* has been rightly explained by Sāyaṇa as meaning "of defective speech", i. e. speaking like barbarians. The word occurs in six passages in the Ṛgveda, viz. *dáno víśa Indra mṛdhrávācaḥ saptá yát púraḥ śárma śáradir dárt ṛṇór apó anavadyárṇā yúne vṛtráṃ Purukútsāya randhiḥ*, o Indra thou didst master the *mṛdhravac* settlements, when thou brokest their refuge, the autumnal fastnesses; thou madest the streaming waters stream, thou madest the foe subject to young Purukutsa, i. 174. 2, where Yāska explains *mṛduvāc*, Sāyaṇa *amarṣaṇavacana; anaso dásyūr amṛṇo vadhéna ní duryoṇá āvṛṇaṅ mṛdhrávācaḥ*, thou crushedst the noseless dasyus with thy weapon, puttest down the *mṛdhravāc* in battle, v. 29. 10, where Sāyaṇa explains *hiṃsitavāgindriyān asurān; apádam Atráṃ mahatā́ vadhéna ní duryoṇá āvṛṇaṅ mṛdhrávācam*, Atra he put down in battle, devoid of his feet, the *mṛdhravāc* (Sāyaṇa *hiṃsitavāgindriyaṃ jṛmbhābhibhutam ity arthaḥ)*, v. 32. 8; *ny àkratún grathíno mṛdhrávācaḥ Paṇír aśraddhā́ avṛdhā́ ayajñā́n*, (Agni beat) down the Paṇis, who had no pious insight, the knotty ones, the *mṛdhravāc*, who had no faith, did not worship nor sacrifice, vii. 6. 3, where Sāyaṇa explains *hiṃsitavacaska; jéṣma Pūrúṃ vidáthe mṛdhrávacam*, we conquered Pūru, the *mṛdhravāc*, in the fight, vii. 18. 13 (Sāyaṇa *bādhavāc*); *yó vācá́ vívāco mṛdhrávācaḥ purū́ sahásraśivā jaghána*, who with his voice beat those who were engaged in quarrel, the *mṛdhravāc*, many thousands, x. 23. 5 (Sāyaṇa *hiṃsitavāc)*.

In all these instances we are faced with some quality in the manner of speaking of enemies, and the most natural explanation is to think of what most people are apt to say about the speech of their adversaries, that it is faulty, barbarous. *Mṛdhravāc* is probably essentially the same thing as *mleccha*. This explanation is not made improbable by the use of the term to denote Puru in vii. 18. 13. Even in our days some people are apt to abuse the language of those with whom they quarrel, though they may be related to them.

I think we may safely infer that the use of the word *mṛdhravāc* shows that the *dasyus* and *dāsas* were considered as speaking a tongue that differed from that of the Aryans. But it does not help us to localize them. It is, however, possible to get further.

vii. 5. 3. we hear about the dark tribes, the *viśaḥ asiknīḥ*, who tremble when Agni breaks the fastnesses, and ix. 41. 1 Soma is said to beat away the black skin *(ghnántaḥ kṛṣṇā́m ápa tvácam)*, and this black skin is evidently identical with the *dasyu* mentioned in the

[1] Vedische Studien, i, p. 36.

[2] ZDMG. lxxi, p. 319.

next stanza (*sāhvāṃso dásyum avratám*). Similarly the dasyu is contrasted with the Aryan colour (*hatví dásyun práryaṃ várṇam avat*, iii. 34. 9), and the gods are asked to quench the fury of the dāsa and carry our, i. e. the Aryan, colour to well-being (*devāso manyúṃ dāsasya śamnan té na á vakṣant suvitāya várṇam*, i. 104. 2), while Indra puts the dāsa colour down into hiding (*yó dásaṃ várṇam ádharaṃ gúhākaḥ*, ii. 12. 4). That this dāsa colour was dark, can also be safely inferred from the fact that the dāsa women are characterized as dark-wombed, *kṛṣṇayonīḥ*, ii. 20. 7.

It has been generally assumed that this dark colour of the enemies of the Aryans points to India and not to the pre-Indian home of the Aryans, where we do not know of the existence of black races. The aboriginal inhabitants of India, the Dravidians and the Kolarians, are even at the present day looked down upon by the Indian Aryans on account of their dark skin.

It has also been recognized by most scholars that some other adjectives used to characterize the dasyus and dāsas point in the same direction. The dasyus are once described as *anās*, v. 29. 10, and Max Müller was no doubt right in translating this word as "noseless". This designation has been explained as referring to the broad noses of the Dravidian and Kolarian races, which are not infrequently depressed at the root. Similarly the dāsa Bull's lip (*vṛṣaśipra*, vii. 99. 4) reminds us of the big protruding lips of those same races.

Such indications are further strengthened by a consideration of the surroundings in which we find the dasyus and dāsas. I am quite unable to follow scholars such as Brunnhofer and Hillebrandt in finding a series of localities outside of India in the names mentioned in the Ṛgveda. The seven rivers, on which Indra wards off the weapon of the dāsa from the Aryan (viii. 24. 27), are Indian streams, and the same is the case with the individual rivers mentioned in the hymns. The chiefs and kings who are represented as the adversaries of dasyus and dāsas are, so far as we can judge, Indo-Aryan princes. Atri is directly characterized as such through the designation *pāñcajanya* (i. 117. 3). Such princes are Atri (i. 117. 3; v. 7. 10), Ugrādeva (i. 36. 18), Ṛjiśvan (i. 51. 5), Kutsa (i. 51. 6; i. 63. 3; iv. 16. 10, 11, 12; v. 29. 10; x. 49. 3; x. 105. 11), Turvaśa and Turvîti (i. 36. 18), Trasadasyu (iv. 38. 1), Dabhîti (ii. 13. 9; i. 15. 9; iv. 30. 21; vii. 19. 4), Divodāsa Atithigva (i. 51. 6; vi. 31. 4), Navavāstva Bṛhadratha, who is however also treated as a dāsa (i. 36. 18), Purukutsa (vi. 20. 10), Purūravas (x. 95. 7), Pūrus (i. 59. 6; iv. 38. 1), Bharadvāja (vi. 31. 4), &c. Though the narrative is occasionally mythical, there cannot usually be any doubt that we are on historical, Indian soil, and designations or birudas such as Trasadasyu and Dasyave vṛka have a thoroughly historical stamp.

We know the names of several individual dasyus and dasas. As remarked by Oldenberg[1], some of them may belong to the mythical sphere, most of them, however, look

[1] loc. cit. p. 152.

quite unsuspicious and probably belonged to non-Aryan chiefs who fought against the Aryans.

I do not intend to examine all such names. That would be a useless work, considering how scanty our information is. I shall only mention one of them, who seems to have played a prominent role, the dasyu or dāsa Śambara, the adversary of Atithigva Divodāsa (i. 51. 6; i. 103. 8; i. 112. 14; i. 130. 7; ii. 19. 6; vi. 26. 5; vi. 31. 4; vi. 43. 1; vi. 47. 22; ix. 61. 2). We hear how his fastnesses are destroyed and he himself is brought to bay in the fourtieth autumn (ii. 12. 11), i. e. after a prolonged war.

His power must have been considerable. We hear of his ninety nine (ii. 19. 6; iv. 26. 3; vi. 47. 2; vii. 99. 5) or hundred (ii. 14. 6; vi. 31. 4) fastnesses. According to iv. 26. 3, that latter figure includes the harem, cf. *ahám púro mandasānó vy aíraṃ náva sākáṃ navatíḥ Śámbarasya śatatamáṃ veśyàṃ sarvátātā Dívodāsam Atithigváṃ yád āvam*, getting exhilarated I destroyed the ninety nine fastnesses of Śambara, and the harem as the hundredth one, thoroughly, when I protected Divodāsa Atithigva. I think that Geldner[1] has explained this stanza correctly, but I do not think that we have to do with myths, but with legends based on historical facts. Śambara fought from his fastnesses and finally sought refuge in his harem, where he was slain. I would connect v. 30. 9 with this tradition, and in such small features I see an additional proof that the dealings with Śambara were comparatively recent history.

Śambara is frequently mentioned together with another dāsa Varcin, whose hundred thousand men are said to have been slain (ii. 14. 6; iv. 30. 15; vi. 47. 21; vii. 99. 5). vi. 47. 21 we read about Indra, *áhan dásā vṛṣabhó vasnayántodávraje Várcinaṃ Śámbaraṃ ca*, the bull slew the bargaining dāsas Varcin and Śambara in Udavraja. According to Sāyaṇa Udavraja is a locality *(deśaviśeṣa)*. Ludwig translates "in the water-enclosure", while Roth and Grassmann think that Udavraja is the name of a person, because a patronymic *Audavraji* is mentioned in the gaṇa Paṇini ii. iv. 59. Ludwig's translation is etymologically unobjectionable, I do not however see any reason for deviating from Sāyaṇa, and I even think it possible to localize Udavraja, "the water-pen", with some probability.

It is frequently mentioned that Śambara resided in a hill country and was driven down from a great mountain. Cf. *áva tmánā dhṛṣatá Śámbaraṃ bhinat*, boldly didst thou break Śambara down, i. 54. 4; *Atithigváya Śámbaraṃ girér ugró ávābharat*, for the benefit of Atithigva the valiant one brought down Śambara from the mountain, i. 130. 7; *yáḥ Śámbaraṃ párvateṣu kṣiyántaṃ catvāriṃśyáṃ śarády anvávindat*, who in the fourtieth autumn found out Śambara, who was residing in the hills, ii. 12. 11; *utá dāsáṃ Kauḷitaráṃ bṛhatáḥ párvatād ádhi ávāhan Indra Śámbaram*, and, o Indra, thou beatest the dāsa Kaulitara Śambara down from the big mountain, iv. 30. 14; *áva girér dásaṃ Śámbaraṃ han právo Dívodāsaṃ citrábhir utí*, from the hill thou beatest down the

[1] Vedische Studien, iii, p. 36.

dāsa Śambara, thou protectedst Divodāsa with manifold protection, vi. 26.5; *dévakaṃ cid mānyamānáṃ jaganthāva tmána bṛhatáḥ Śámbaraṃ bhet*, thou didst slay him who thought himself even a godling, break Śambara down from the big (mountain), vii. 18. 20; *yó nántvāny ánaman ny ójasotádardar manyúnā Śámbaraṃ ví pracyāvayad ácyutā bráhmaṇas pátir á cáviṣad vásumantaṃ ví párvatam*, Brahmaṇaspati who with strength bent what should be bent, who in anger split the Śambara (fastnesses), who shook what had not been shaken, and mounted the mountain that abounded in riches, ii. 24. 2.

Śambara was accordingly a non-Aryan chief who resided in the hills, and Udavraja, where he was finally brought to bay, must have been situated in the hills.

We may further compare vii. 99. 4 f., *urúṃ yajñáya cakrathur u lokáṃ janáyantā súryam uṣásam agníṃ dásasya cid vṛṣaśiprásya māyá jaghnáthur narā pṛtanájyeṣu. Índrāviṣṇu dṛṃhitaḥ Śámbarasya náva púro navatíṃ ca śnathiṣṭam śatáṃ Varcínaḥ sahásraṃ ca sākáṃ hathó apratý ásurasya vīrán*, you provided broad space for the sacrifice, producing sun, dawn, and fire; even dāsa Bull's-lip's illusive power you beat, O heroes, in battles; O Indra and Viṣṇu, the ninety nine strong fastnesses of Śambara you smote, and irresistibly you slew the hundred thousand men of the asura Varcin.

Though the narrative is here more or less mythical, the old historical background can still be felt, and it is of interest that we hear of dāsa Bull's lip in this connexion. I have already explained this designation by a reference to the big protruding lips of the Dravidian and Kolarian tribes of present India. It is then tempting to compare the name or patronymic *Kaulitara* used to denote Śambara in iv. 30. 14 with the ethnic term Kol, Koli, which is also contained in the designation Kolarian. I do not think it possible to attach much importance to such similarity in sound. I should like, however, to add that the name Śambara reminds us of the designation Śabara, which denotes an old Kolarian tribe, so that Śambara may have been a chief of that tribe.

Śambara is once brought into connexion with a certain Arbuda. Cf. *tvám Kútsaṃ Suṣṇahátyeṣv āvitháraṇdhayo 'tithigvāya Śámbaram mahántaṃ cid Arbudáṃ ní kramīḥ padā́ sanád evá dasyuhátyāya jajñiṣe*, thou protectedst Kutsa in the slaying of Śuṣṇa, thou conqueredst Śambara for Atithigva, with thy foot thou troddest down even great Arbuda, from old times thou wast born to slay dasyus, i. 51. 6.

Arbuda is further mentioned in six other places in the Ṛgveda:

ii. 11. 20, *asyá suvanásya mandínaḥ Tritásya ny Árbudaṃ vavṛdhanó astaḥ*, increasing (through the libations) of pressing, refreshing Trita he threw down Arbuda;

ii. 14. 4, *yó Árbudam áva nīcā́ babādhé* (Indra), who pressed Arbuda deep down;

viii. 3. 19, *nír Árbudasya Mṛgayasya māyíno níḥ Párvatasya gā́ ajaḥ*, thou (O Indra), drovest down the cows of Arbuda, of crafty Mṛgaya, of Parvata (or, of the mountain);

viiii. 32. 3, *ny Árbudasya viṣṭápaṃ varṣmāṇaṃ bṛhatás tira*, put down the summit of Arbuda, the height of the big one;

viii. 32. 26, *áhan vṛtrám ṛṣṣama Aurṇavabhám Ahiśúvam himénāvidhyad Arbudam*, the glorious one slew Vṛtra, Aurṇavabha, Ahiśuva, he struck Arbuda with frost;

x. 67. 12, *Índro . . . maható arṇavásya vi murdhánam abhinad Arbudásya*, Indra split the head of great watery Arbuda.

It will be seen that the conception is throughout more or less mythical. Some features, however, tend to show that there is a substratum of fact in the myth. Indra presses Arbuda down with his foot (*ni kramiḥ pada*, i. 51. 6; *ny astaḥ*, ii. 11. 20; *ava nicā babādhe*, ii. 14. 4); Arbuda has a head or summit (*murdhan*, x. 67. 12; *viṣṭapa, varṣman*, viii. 32. 3), abounds in water (*arṇava*, x. 67. 12) and is pierced with frost (*himena*, viii. 32. 26). Hillebrandt, it is true, translates[1] the words *himénāvidhyad Árbudam*, viii. 32. 26, "he slew Arbuda in winter". This translation is, however, not in accordance with the usual meaning of the word *hima* in the Ṛgveda.

If we were to judge from the indications just mentioned, without any bias, I think we should infer that Arbuda was some high mountain, rich in water and exposed to frost, and it would be natural to explain the occurrence of Arbuda in connexion with Śambara in i. 51. 6 as indicating that Arbuda was one of the hills held by that ancient chief.

If Arbuda were the name of a mountain, we would naturally think of a mountain lying away from other hills in such a position that some explanation for its being found in these surroundings seemed to be called for. The wording of the passages where Arbuda is mentioned is such that we are led to infer that it was considered to be a great feat of Indra to have placed it where it is actually found.

Numerous tales are known from various parts of the world, tales invented in order to explain the position of isolated rocks and mountains or similar features. They have been placed into position by some ancient hero or god, usually by the supernatural being who was, in each country, considered as being most capable of such valorous acts, and in Vedic India, Indra would naturally be the one thought of.

In my own Norwegian home-valley, there is a big rock in the middle of a lake. When I was a child, I was frequently told that this rock once formed the summit of one of the surrounding hills. St. Olav, the national saint, beat it down with his fist in order to use it for the purpose of building a bridge over the easternmost end of the lake. He placed the rock on a sledge and pulled it eastwards over the ice. The ice, however, broke and the rock was left where it is.

I have no doubt that this tale is an ancient one, and that St. Olav has only been introduced at a later period, replacing another agent, most probably Þórr, as the paragon of strength and valour. And I think that the Arbuda myth has a similar origin, and that also here the principal agent, the god Indra, has perhaps replaced some older deity or hero.

[1] Vedische Mythologie, iii, p. 202.

It is a well-known fact that the Indo-Aryans told tales about flying mountains that had ultimately been fixed in position by Indra.[1] We may probably infer that such tales were chiefly told about hills situated away from the great mountain ranges. We may also reasonably suppose that they were partly pre-Aryan, the agent who fixed the mountains having originally been a pre-Aryan Indian deity.

If Indra or somebody else had placed the hills in position, they must have come from somewhere, and the idea of winged mountains flying about in the sky might be very old in India. Folk-lore and fairy tales have been drawn upon by every mythology and every religion.

I think that the Arbuda legend should be seen in connexion with the myth about the winged mountains. Arbuda was a hill that had been fixed in position by Indra.

In Indian tradition, however, Arbuda is primarily not a mountain, but a serpent demon, who is also designated with the patronymic Kādraveya. An Arbuda Kādraveya is also mentioned as the author of Ṛv. x. 94.

This Arbuda plays a role in ancient Indian folk-lore, as testified by old tales incorporated in the Brahmaṇas. Thus the Śat. Br. xiii. 4. 3. 9 contains a *pāriplava ākhyāna* which should be narrated on the occasion of the horse-sacrifice:
atha pañcame 'han, evam evaitāsv iṣṭiṣu saṃsthitāsv eṣaivāvṛd: adhvaryav iti; havai hotar ity evādhvaryur. Arbudaḥ Kādraveyo rājety āha. Tasya sarpā viśas ta ima āsata ity. Sarpaś ca sarpavidaś copasametā bhavanti. Tān upadiśati, sarpavidyā vedaḥ, so 'yam iti sarpavidyāyā ekaṃ parva vyācakṣāṇa iva, then on the fifth day, after these offerings have been performed in just such a manner, there is just this procedure. "O Adhvaryu" (says the hotṛ). The Adhvaryu (says): "Well hotṛ." "Arbuda Kādrayeya is the king. The serpents are his subjects, they are sitting here." The serpents and those who know about serpents have gathered here. Those he teaches, "the serpent-lore is the veda, this is as follows", as if explaining a chapter of the serpent-lore.

The same story is also told in the Śāṅkhāyana and Āśvalāyana Śrauta Sūtras. Another one is found Ait. Br. vi. 1, Kauś. Br. xxix. 1. The version of the Ait. Br. is the fullest one:

deva ha vai Sarvacarau satraṃ niṣedus, te ha pāpmānaṃ nāpajaghnire. Tān hovācārbudaḥ Kādraveyaḥ sarparṣir mantrakṛd, ekā vai vo hotrakṛtā, taṃ vo 'haṃ karavāṇy atha pāpmānam apahaniṣadhva iti. Te ha tathety ucus. Teṣāṃ ha sma sa madhyandine madhyandina evodāsarpad grāvṇo 'bhiṣṭauti. Tasmān madhyandine madhyandina eva gravṇo 'bhiṣṭuvanti tadanukṛti. Sa ha sma yenodasarpat tad dhāpy etarhy Arbudodāsarpaṇ nāma prapad asti, the gods sat down to a sattra with Sarvacaru. They could not beat away the evil. To them Arbuda Kādraveya, the serpent ṛṣi, the composer of

[1] Cf. Pischel, Vedische Studien, i, p. 174.

hymns, said: "one hotṛ-ceremony has been neglected by you, I will perform it for you, and you will beat off the evil." They said, "so be it." He crept up at each noon-libation and spoke incantations over the pressing-stones. Therefore they speak incantations over the pressing-stones at each noon-libation, in imitation of him. Where he crept up, there is even now the path called "Arbuda's creeping-up".

In the Mahābhārata Arbuda is mentioned twice. ii. 806 we hear about a serpent-demon *(pannaga)* Arbuda in Girivraja, and iii. 4097 ff. Arbuda is mentioned as a tirtha:

tato gaccheta dharmajña Himavatsutam Arbudam pṛthivyaṃ yatra vai chidraṃ pūrvam āsīd Yudhiṣṭhira.

Tatrāśramo Vasiṣṭhasya triṣu lokeṣu viśrutaḥ,

then he should go, O thou who knowest the law, to Arbuda, the son of Himavat, where there was formerly, O Yudhiṣṭhira, a chasm in the earth. There is Vasiṣṭha's aśrama, renowned in the three worlds.

In order to fix the position of this tirtha, we must consider the localities preceding and following it in the Mahābhārata. We are told that, after visiting Mahakāla (in Ujjayini) one should proceed to Bhadravaṭa and thence to Narmada, the Dakṣiṇa Sindhu, i. e. the Central Indian river Sindh, Carmaṇvati, i. e. the Chambal, and Arbuda. From Arbuda then the way goes on to Prabhāsa.

The route is somewhat circuitous, Arbuda must, however, be looked for between the Chambal River and Kathiavar. Being designated son of Himavat, Arbuda must be a mountain, and we are no doubt right in identifying the Arbuda tirtha of the Mahabharata with the famous Mount Abū, which is in inscriptions[1] called Arbuda and son of Himavat, and which is also designated in the same way in the Arbudamāhatmya[2], where we are further told that Himavat gave his son to Vasiṣṭha, that he might fill up a deep chasm into which his cow had fallen.

In the Rajputana Gazetteer, Vol. iii. A, Allahabad 1909, p. 286, we read, "According to tradition, Mount Abu was formerly a level plain stretching to the Aravallis and the favourite resort of gods and sages. At one spot was a huge chasm of unfathomable depth, into which the cow Nandini, who used to supply the Muni Vasistha with anything he asked for, happened to fall. In his distress, the sage called on the sacred river Saraswati to help him, and Nandini was saved by a miraculous rise of the waters which floated her up on to dry land. Fearing that such an accident might occur again, Vasistha appealed to Siva, who referred him to Himachal, the lord of the Himalayas; the latter received him courteously and, having ascertained the object of his visit, called his sons together and enquired which of them would volunteer to fill up the fissure. The youngest son, Nandivardhan, offered his services, but being lame and unable to travel, said to Vasistha, "I

[1] Cf. Hultzsch, Ep. Ind. ix, p. 71.

[2] Cf. Bhandarkar, Ep. Ind. ix, p. 189 [2].

have a good friend, a mighty snake by name Arbudha; if you petition him, he will carry me". The sage did as he was bid, and Arbudha consented to convey Nandivardhan on condition that the hill, which would stand above the abyss, was called after him. This having been agreed to, the serpent placed Nandivardhan in his hood and set out on his journey; on reaching their destination, they plunged into the chasm, but it was so deep that only the god's nose could be seen, while the snake's writhings made the earth rock. Once more Siva was appealed to for aid, and from his shrine at Benares, he extended his foot till one toe appeared just above the ground, and the tremor ceased entirely. The fissure was filled in, and above it arose a majestic mountain called Arbudha . . . after the serpent."

I have no hesitation in connecting this tradition with the myth which must be inferred from the indications of the Ṛgveda. A big mountain has been placed into position by the instrumentality of a great god, there is a question about a cow or cows that are rescued, and also water plays a role. We may even note such details as the use of the foot by Śiva in order to steady the mountain, while in the Ṛgveda Indra treads Arbuda down with his foot.

The Gazetteer version throughout betrays its later date. The tradition about the serpent, which we have already found in the Brahmaṇas, has been adopted. I have not, however, any doubt that it is secondary, and Arbuda is, as we have seen, even in comparatively late texts the son of Himavat and not a snake. It should be borne in mind that the word *nāga*, snake, also denotes a mountain, though this use of the word has not been found in old texts.

Further Śiva has been substituted for Indra as the acting deity. This change is of some interest as an illustration of the well-known fact that the names of the chief actors of old folk-tales are floating, each country and each period mentioning the person who is there and then considered most fit for each individual feat. Indra was, in medieval India, no more the recognized type of manly valour. Śiva had to a large extent taken his place in popular imagination, just as Indra himself had perhaps in Vedic times replaced other agents.

I would therefore identify the Vedic Arbuda with the present Mount Abū, and I may add that the other meanings of the word *arbuda*, swelling, tumour, polypus, foetus, well suit this explanation, the isolated Arbuda mountain being appropriately designated as a tumour of the earth. It should not be overlooked that Mount Ābū is situated at a considerable distance from the big mountain ranges, and its position is such that it would quite naturally stir popular imagination and give rise to folk-tales. The Vedic version seems to have been that it was placed in its present position by Indra, and we may probably infer from the modern folk-tales that he was considered to have cut it off from some big mountain range, perhaps from the Himālaya.

Some such tradition must also have been known to those who furnished the ancient Greek authors with information about India. Ptolemy vii. i. 19 speaks of the Aravali hills and Mount Abu as ἀποκοπα ὄρη, mountains that are cut off, and also calls them ποιναὶ θεῶν, punishments of the gods, a designation which was apparently also known to Megasthenes and is at the bottom of Pliny's Capitalia (vi. 75).

We have seen that Indra is said to have struck Arbuda with frost (cf. *himénavidhyad Arbudam* viii. 32. 26). In this connexion it is of interest to note that Mount Abū is not free from frost. To quote the Rajputana Gazetteer (Vol. iiii. A, p. 234), "from December to the end of February the climate is healthy and bracing, and fires are required; frosty nights are frequent, thin ice sometimes forms on still water, and a cold north-easterly wind often blows over the hill. . . . The minimum temperature recorded was 11.5° on the 20th December 1880."

If I am right in identifying the Vedic Arbuda with Mount Abū, the Arbudodasarpaṇi is at the present day represented by the road that mounts Mount Abu through a magnificent ghaṭ, and where now tongas and probably motor cars are running. Formerly it must have been rather difficult of access.

If we assume that Mount Abu was, in Vedic times, one of the strongholds of the dasyus, we can easily imagine how difficult it must have been to conquer them. In the autumn, which has always been the proper season for military expeditions in India, they sought refuge in their "autumnal fastnesses", and from their hills they made predatory inroads into the country of the Aryans and stole their cows and property. Indra helped his people in their fights in order to recover what had been stolen and drove the cattle down again from Arbuda (viii. 3. 19) and other strongholds of the enemies.

If we further bear in mind the connexion apparently existing between Arbuda and Sambara, it is perhaps possible to localize Udavraja on Mount Abu and identify it with the famous lake Nakhi Talao, which might very properly be characterized as a "water-enclosure" or *udavraja*. It is described in the Rajputana Gazetteer, Vol. iii. A, p. 285, as follows. "It is now about half a mile long by a quarter of a mile broad, and is most picturesquely situated between high hills except at the western end, where a view of the plains is obtained through a gorge". It is even tempting to assume that there is some connexion between the frequent mentioning of water as the result of the fightings between aryas and dasyus and the conquest of the famous lake, if we bear in mind how difficult it must have been for the Aryans to provide sufficient water supply in that neighbourhood, though here of course the prevailing idea is a different one.

In dealing with the traditionary tales connected with Mount Abu, we have seen that according to one tradition Vasiṣṭha appealed to the river Sarasvati in order to recover the lost cow Nandini. Sarasvati is then said to have filled up the chasm in the ground where now Mount Abu is situated, in other words, Sarasvati was considered to have sunk into

the ground at this place. We are here reminded of the Vinaśana, though this is usually localized in the Panjab itself.

The Vinaśana, which is already mentioned in the Pañcaviṃśa xxv. 10. 1, is the place where, according to Mah. iii. 10538 the realm of the Niṣadas begins, and we may safely assume that the whole country to the south and east was considered as forming part of the Niṣāda country which would, accordingly, comprise also Mount Ābū.

The Niṣadas were, at a very early date, the neighbours of the Indian Aryans. Yaska informs us, Naighaṇṭu iii. 8, that Aupamanyava explained the word *pañcajana* as denoting the four castes and the Niṣadas, and he adds that the Niṣadas earn their living by killing living beings, *prāṇivadhajīvana*, i. e. they were largely hunters and fishermen. According to Mahidhara on Vaj. Saṃh. xvi. 27 the *Niṣādas* are identical with the *giricara maṃsadino Bhillāḥ*, and Ait. Br. viii. 11 they are mentioned as robbers in the woods, and Sayaṇa informs us that they were *nīcajātayo manuṣyāḥ*.

The Bhillas, who are thus identified with the Niṣādas, are the modern Bhils, and they are tribes of the same kind as the Śabaras, who have already been mentioned in connexion with the old dasyu chief Śambara. The terms *Bhilla* and *Śabara* are sometimes used promiscuously. Thus the Kathasaritsagara ci. 273 ff. and the Bṛhatkathamañjarī ix. 1386 ff. relate how Sundarasena comes to a Pulinda-palli inhabited by Śabaras (Bṛhat. 1401) and is attacked by the men of the Pulinda-king Vindhyaketu (Kathas 284). He is then taken prisoner by the Śabaras (Bṛhat. 1403, Kathās. 289). Later on Vindhyaketu is repeatedly (Kathās. 306, 313; Bṛhat. 1417) called Bhilla-king, and it is evident that Pulinda Śabara and Bhilla are quite interchangeable terms. They were all old Niṣāda-tribes belonging to the ancient non-Aryan races beyond the Vinaśana. They are also called dasyus (e. g. Kathas. l. c. 287), and this term is, according to Manu x. 45, used as a common designation of outcastes, while in Manu's system a Niṣāda is the son of a Brahmaṇa and a Śūdra woman (x. 8). All these terms were used somewhat promiscuously to denote various low-caste people, and we shall probably not go wrong in stating that they denote the descendants of the Vedic dasyus and dāsas.

The Bhīl tribes are now found over a wide area in Central India, the Bombay Presidency and Rājputānā. Mr. Crooke[1] further informs us that "according to local tradition they were once the ruling race in Rajputana, Central India and Gujarat, and it is believed that they, like the Kolis, were reduced to subjection by the Rajput tribes, who from the end of the fifth century began to push their way southwards. In many of the states of Rajputana, Malwa, and Gujarat this claim is recognized by their overlords, and whenever a Rajput chief succeeds to the throne, it is a necessary part of the rite of investiture that his brow should be marked with blood drawn from the thumb or toe of a Bhil. He thus becomes admitted by the covenant of blood into the kin of the ancient rulers of the land."

[1] Natives of Northern India, London 1907, pp. 66 f.

The Bhils are not Aryans, and it is interesting to note that they are frequently designated as *kāli paraj*, black people, just as the Vedic Aryans spoke of their non-Aryan enemies, the dasyus or dāsas. It has not been possible to decide whether the Bhils should be considered as Dravidians or Kolarians.[1]

To the east of the Bhils we find the Śabaras, who are, as we have seen, confounded with them in the Kathāsaritsāgara. They are an ancient tribe and are even at the present day found distributed over a wide area. According to Ait. Br. vii. 18, they were dasyus and descended from the sons of Viśvāmitra. They are here mentioned between the Andhras and Puṇḍras on one side and the Pulindas and Mutibas on the other. In the Atharva Pariśiṣṭa li. 5. 1 they are put together with Pulindas, Cetis and Gādhas, and also elsewhere we find them in the company of non-Aryan tribes. In Varahamihira's Bṛhatsaṃhitā they are mentioned after the Abhiras and before the Pahlavas, Mallas and Matsyas (v. 36); after shepherds and before Śūdras, Puṇḍras, wild western tribes, Śūlikas, Vanavāsins and Draviḍas (ix. 15); together with Pulindas (ix. 29); after Daśārṇa, Yavana, Ujjayinī and before Pāriyātra and Kuntibhoja (x. 15); together with Yavanas (x. 18); as living in the south-east together with southern tribes in and about the Vindhya hills (xiv. 10); after Śaka, Yavana and Magadha and before Prāgjyotiṣa, Cīna and Kāmboja (xvi. 1).

We thus get the impression that they were distributed over a wide area, and this impression is strengthened by a consideration of the state of things at the present day, where we find the Śabaras under several slightly different names. According to Cunningham[2] "the limits of the tract inhabited by the western Sauras (i. e. Śabaras) may be defined with some certainty as follows:

On the east, from Sabalgarh and Pahargarh on the Chambal, *viā* Gwâlior and Jhânsi, to Urcha on the Betwa, and thence *via* Damoh to Singhorgarh, where the Gonds are met with, about 225 miles.

On the south, from Singhorgarh, following the line of hills which forms the northern boundary of the Narbada valley, to Bhilsa, Bhupāl, and Ashta, where the Bhîls are met with, about 200 miles.

On the west, from Ashta, northward, *viā* Mukandra, to near Kota on the Chambal, where the Bhîls are again met with, about 160 miles.

On the north, from the neighbourhood of Kota following the Chambal river to the north-east to Sabalgarh and Pahārgarh, about 200 miles.

Within the limits thus specified the extent of the country occupied by the Sauras or Savaras is about 40000 square miles. The Sauras, however, form but a small part of the population, excepting in the hilly and jungly tracts of Lalitpur and Sironj in the south, and Sheopur and Sabalgarh in the north, where they are about one-sixth of the whole,

[1] Cf. my remarks in the Linguistic Survey of India, Vol. ix, Part iii, pp. 9 f.

[2] Archaeological Survey of India, xvii, pp. 112 ff.

while in the less hilly tracts they form not more than one-twelfth. In the open plains not a single Saura house was ever met with."

It is evident from this state of things that the so-called western Sauras are the remnants of an old aboriginal population, which has gradually been replaced or overlaid by Aryan invaders.

The bulk of the Śabaras is, however, now found further to the east, in Chota Nagpur, Orissa, Western Bengal and the Madras Presidency. In that region we still find members of the tribe who speak a non-Aryan language, and this tongue is, as is well known, a Kolarian form of speech[1].

We can, I think, safely assert that the Śabaras are a Kolarian tribe, and that they have once been distributed over a wider area than at the present day. Like the Bhils and other broken tribes they are the remnants of a population which we have every reason for considering as aboriginal, and which has, in the course of time, gradually been driven back by the Aryans. If the Vedic Śambara was a Śabara chief, he must then have been a Kolarian, and we should have to infer that the old inhabitants conquered by the Aryan invaders and called dasyus or dāsas by them were partly of Kolarian race.

We are comparatively well informed about the distribution of the Kolarian family of speech at the present day. I have put together the main facts in the fourth volume of the Linguistic Survey, and it will be seen that the head-quarters of the Kolarian languages are the Chota Nagpur plateau, up to the Ganges in the north, and the north-eastern corner of the Madras Presidency. Small Kolarian islets are further found in the Central Provinces and Berar, where the Kurkus of the Satpura and Mahadeo hills speak a Kolarian tongue. The Kolarian tracts are partly isolated localities in the midst of tribes speaking Aryan or Dravidian languages, and the impression we get from a consideration of a language map, is that the Kolarian family has been largely reduced by Aryan and also by Dravidian inroads.

The Kolarian languages are related to the Mon-Khmer dialects which form linguistic islands in Assam and Further India. In the third volume of the Linguistic Survey (Part i, pp. 179 ff.) I have further drawn attention to some features which apparently point to the conclusion that Kolarian tongues were once spoken over a large area along the southern slopes of the Himalaya.

The whole state of things leads us to infer that Kolarian tribes once formed the principal population of large tracts in Northern India, just as the Dravidians must be considered as the aboriginal inhabitants of the south. They have been driven back by the Aryans, but also the Dravidians have encroached upon their territory, so that they have had to contend with two different linguistic families, the Aryans from the north-west and the Dravidians from the south.

[1] Cf. my remarks in the Linguistic Survey, iv, pp. 217 ff.

We must, I think, accordingly assume a double set of aboriginal inhabitants of India, who have both come under the influence of the Aryans. It is as yet impossible to prove this hypothesis, I should like, however, to draw the attention of scholars to a linguistic feature which adds some strength to the theory.

In the third fascicle of his Epigraphical contributions[1], Professor Lüders has proved that in Old Ardhamāgadhi male *a*-bases form their nom. plur. in *ā* but their acc. plur. in *āni*. A similar state of things is found in Old Māgadhi and Old Śauraseni. In Bhāsa's Prakrit acc. plur. in *āṇi* of masculine *a*-bases is for instance the rule. In the north-western dialects of the Kharoṣṭhi versions of the Aśoka inscriptions such forms are apparently not correct, nor are they used in Pali, except where we can state the influence of an older Māgadhi version, in the Girnar version of the Aśoka inscriptions and in Māhārāṣṭri.

If we abstract from the north-western frontier, we can accordingly distinguish between northern and southern languages in the inflexion of male *a*-bases. In the north the acc. plur. has the same form as in neuter bases, in the south the two genders are not confounded in this way.

This state of things has a parallel in certain features in modern Indo-Aryan vernaculars. In most of them there is no more a real neuter gender, the masculine being used instead. Gujarāti and Marāṭhi form an important exception and possess real neuter nouns. We here find a similar grouping in northern and southern dialects as in old Prakrit, and so far as I can see the base of the grouping is the same in both cases. The *āni* form of the acc. plur. of male *a*-bases is the first step towards a complete fusion of the masculine and neuter genders, or, at all events, it betrays a tendency in that direction, and it is scarcely a mere accident that the male *āni*-forms broadly belong to the same area where at the present day the neuter has practically disappeared.

In the classical Prakrit dialects dealt with in Pischel's Prakrit grammar the state of things is no doubt different, neuter and masculine bases being clearly distinguished, though there are numerous irregularities in the manuscripts. We should accordingly have to state an interruption in the development towards dropping the neuter. We must not, however, overlook the fact that there cannot, in the oldest Prakrit texts, be the question of anything but a mere tendency, and, on the other hand, Prakrit grammar has been developed under the influence of Sanskrit and also of Māhārāṣṭri, which is, in the system of most Prakrit grammarians, dealt with as standard Prakrit. We need not, therefore, wonder at the retention of the neuter gender in ordinary Prakrit. We can safely assume that there is, from ancient times, a tendency in the Indo-Aryan vernaculars of the north to confound the masculine and neuter genders. This state of things is not found in Gujarāti, which belongs to the same part of the country as the Girnar version of the Aśoka inscriptions, nor in Marāṭhi, which is derived from ancient Māhārāṣṭri, and we must bear in mind that

[1] SBAW. 1913, pp, 994 ff.

the masculine *āni*-forms are likewise foreign to the Girnar epigraphs and Māhārāṣṭri Prakrit.

We must involuntarily raise the question whether a reason can be found for this different attitude of modern vernaculars. The theory of a double Aryan invasion of India, which has been so ably expounded by the late Dr. Hoernle and especially by Sir George Grierson, but which I have myself never been able to accept, cannot help us here, for Gujarāti and Marāṭhi do not, according to Sir George, belong to the same group, any more than do Hindi and e. g. Bihari. We must therefore try to find another explanation, and it is, I opine, natural to think of the different substrata underlying the modern Indo-Aryan vernaculars.

We know that the Aryans were foreign invaders, and we know that their languages have spread over a wide area where formerly the tongues of the aboriginal inhabitants were spoken. If these tongues were different in the different parts of India, it would be natural that this dissimilarity should be reflected in certain tendencies in the modern forms of speech. And that is what actually seems to be the case.

It should be borne in mind that Gujarāti and Marāṭhi are spoken in tracts where we find Dravidian tribes in the immediate neighbourhood and where Dravidian languages were probably once the popular speech. Most northern vernaculars, on the other hand, are spoken in a territory where we would, according to the indications mentioned above, be inclined to think of a Kolarian substratum.

Let us now examine the Dravidian and Kolarian languages with reference to their attitude towards gender.

In the Kolarian tongues there is no such thing as grammatical gender. Nouns can broadly be subdivided into two groups, such as denote living beings and lifeless objects, respectively, and the inflexion of the two groups is partly different. But there is no distinction between male, female and neuter bases, except where Aryan languages have exercised their influence.

In the Dravidian vernaculars, on the other hand, there are as a rule three genders in such nouns as are used to denote rational beings. The feminine is, moreover, frequently confounded with the neuter. That is the case in the singular in Kurukh, Malto, Kolāmi and Telugu, and in both numbers in Kui and Goṇḍi.

The state of things in Dravidian is accordingly different from that prevailing in northern vernaculars, where the masculine and neuter genders have been confounded. The confusion is carried still further in Bengali and Oriya, where even the difference between masculine and feminine nouns is blotted out. According to Beames[1], the case is similar farther to the west, viz. in Hindi and Panjabi, where "the common people are very careless about the use of the feminine", so that "it may almost be said that grammatical gender

1 A comparative grammar of the modern Aryan languages of India, Vol. ii, p. 147.

scarcely exists out of books". It will be seen that we have here a distinct correspondence with Kolarian principles. In Marathi and Gujarati, on the other hand, three genders are distinguished, and the neuter is a living gender just as in Dravidian tongues.

If we bear in mind that we have indications to show that the state of things was similar in ancient times, the confusion between the genders and especially between the masculine and the neuter beginning in the same parts of the country where we find it at the present day, and if we further remember how Dravidian and Kolarian languages differ with reference to gender, we become inclined to combine the two phenomena and conclude that the northern Indo-Aryan vernaculars have developed in a country where the old home speech was Kolarian, while the substratum over which Gujarati and Marathi have spread, was Dravidian.

We are accordingly again led to the conclusion that the aboriginal population of Northern India was principally Kolarian, while the south, at least the country to the south of the Vindhya, was Dravidian. Such a theory would account for the traces of Kolarian linguistic features along the southern slopes of the Himalaya, and also explain the existence of a Kolarian tongue among the Kurkus of the Satpura and Mahadeo hills.

But then we would have to assume that the Vedic dasyus and dasas were chiefly Kolarians and not Dravidians, and we would be justified in thinking that Śambara was a Kolarian chief, whose strongholds, as we have seen, should be looked for in the Arâvali hills and about the present Mount Abu. The bulk of the Draviḍas apparently only came into contact with the Aryans at a later date, and it is, in this connexion, of interest that the designation Draviḍa is not met with before in the Atharvaparisiṣṭa (pp. 345 and 374), while the Kolarian Śabaras are already mentioned in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa.

At all events, I hope to have made it probable that the Vedic Aryans under the terms dasyu and dāsa understood Indian tribes and not people living outside the country. The numerous tales about Indra's fightings against these enemies are, wherever we are able to analyse them, Indian and not such as have been brought to India by the Aryans from their pre-Indian home. In other words, most of the legendary traditions connected with Indra have been developed in India.

If we bear in mind that the Iranian demon Indra seems to be different from the Vedic Indra, we must necessarily draw the conclusion that the Vedic Aryans knew a superhuman being called Indra before they entered India, but that he did not develope into the mighty god of the Vedic hymns before India had been invaded. It was especially during the battles and fights that followed on this invasion that the Aryans felt the need of a powerful protector against their enemies, and consequently Indra developed into the mighty war-god, and old and new tales about valorous deeds were connected with his name. Only a god of such description can be intended in the Mitani treaty.

The result of the preceding enquiry is accordingly that the Indra of the Mitani treaty was in every likelihood the well-known Vedic god and not an Aryan, pre-Indian deity. An examination of the last name of the list, that of the two Nāsatyas, apparently leads to the same conclusion.

The form of the word, with its *s*, can of course be Indian or Aryan. In Iranian the corresponding name is Naoŋhaiþya. He is described as the demon of discontentment and an adversary of Spenta Armaiti, but the information about him is too scanty for forming an idea of the notions underlying the conception.

The Mitani treaty supposes a dual deity, such as we find in the Vedic Nāsatyau, a frequent designation of the two Aśvins. There are no traces of such a divine couple on Iranian soil. On the other hand, there are certain indications that a single Nāsatya was known and worshipped in India. Ṛv. iv. 3. 6 the word *nāsatya* is used in the singular, and in later times Nasatya is the name of one of the Aśvins, the other being named Dasra. Thus we read in the Bṛhaddevata vii. 6, *Nāsatyaś caiva Dasraś ca yau stutau Aśvinav iti*, Nāsatya and Dasra who are praised under the designation Aśvins. Geldner has therefore[1] explained the Vedic dual *nāsatyau* as an *ekaśeṣa*, meaning Nāsatya (and Dasra), just as the dual *mitra* means Mitra (and Varuṇa), or, more properly, the dual deity Mitra. I do not think that this explanation holds good in all passages where the dual *nāsatyau* occurs in the Ṛgveda. But I have no doubt that the origin of the dual form has been correctly analysed by Geldner. And so far as I can see, the existing state of things makes it necessary to infer that the dual designation Nasatyau is of Indian growth. If we had two manuscript families of some book, and one family and some manuscripts of the other one agreed in reading a word in a certain way, while other copies of the second family had another reading, we should be inclined to prefer the reading found in both families. In the same way there is every presumption that the single Nāsatya, whom we know from Iranian and Indian sources, goes back into the period of Indo-Iranian unity, while the divine couple of the Ṛgveda is an Indian innovation, due to a combination of the ancient Aryan demon Nasatya with another one who was closely connected with him.

As far as I can see, everything points to the conclusion that Jacobi was right in maintaining that the Mitani gods were Indian and not Aryan, so that we must, in fact, assume that the sphere of Indian civilization had, in the middle of the second millennium B. C., extended into Mesopotamia. The epoch of the Aryan conquest of India and the beginning of Indian civilization must consequently be relegated to a still earlier period, though we have no means of stating how long an interval we must assume between the Aryan invasion and the Mitani treaty. There is, however, one small detail which prevents us from thinking that this interval was quite short.

[1] Vedische Studien, iii, pp. 71 f.

The Vedic gods mentioned in the treaty are not, of course, meant as an enumeration of all, or even of the principal Indian gods of the Mitani chiefs. Only such deities are mentioned as have something to do with the treaty itself. It is, therefore, quite natural that the list is opened by Mitra, the god of compacts and the personification of friendship. We also easily understand why the name of Varuṇa follows. He watches over solemn engagements and obligations connected with the treaty. Also Indra's role is easily intelligible. He is the god of war and battles whose activity has led to the conclusion of the peace. But what have the Nāsatyas to do with the treaty?

To quote Macdonell[1], the two Aśvins of the Ṛgveda "have come to be typically succouring divinities. They are the speediest helpers and deliverers from distress in general. They are constantly praised for such deeds. In particular, they rescue from the ocean in a ship or ships . . . Their rescue from all kinds of distress is a peaceful manifestation of divine grace, not a deliverance from foes in battle, as is generally the case with Indra (with whom, however, they are once associated in fight, even receiving the epithet of Vṛtra-slayers). They are thus also characteristically divine physicians, who heal diseases with their remedies, restoring sight, curing the blind, sick, and maimed. They are the physicians of the gods and guardians of immortality, who ward off death from the worshipper. Apart from their character as helpers, healers, and wonder-workers, their general beneficence is often praised. They bring their worshipper to old age with seeing eye and abundance of children."

There is nothing in this description which helps us to understand why the Nāsatyas are invoked in the Mitani treaty. One might think that they have been considered as restoring deities and are invoked as such to reestablish normal relations between the inimical parties. Such an explanation would, however, be rather far-fetched and unlikely, especially if we bear in mind that their activity is always described as a peaceful manifestation and not as the consequence of war and battles.

There is, however, one feature in the Aśvin myths which is of especial interest in connexion with the Mitani treaty. The Nāsatyas are the two husbands of Sūryā, the sun's daughter, and there is no part of the Aśvin-legend which is more frequently alluded to in the Ṛgveda. It is a well-known fact that Sūryā came to be considered as the typical bride and her legend to play a role in the ancient marriage-rites. In late hymns the two Aśvins then develope into the typical groomsmen who are invoked to conduct the bride home in their chariot.

There is nothing to show that this conception is old in the Ṛgveda. We hear, it is true, that the Aśvins bestow a child on the eunuch's wife, a husband on the old maid or a bride on a favourite, but such deeds are of the same kind as their usual feats, where they act

[1] Vedic Mythology, p. 51.

as helpers and protectors in need and distress. It is only in a late hymn that they are invoked to take the bride home to the bridegroom.

It is, however, evidently this side of their nature which accounts for their being mentioned in the Mitani treaty.

We have seen how that compact was concluded after a war between the Hittite king Subbiluliuma and the Mitani king, and how Subbiluliuma installed Mattiuaza as king of the Mitani and gave him his own daughter in marriage.

I have no hesitation in asserting that it is on account of this marriage that the Nāsatyas are invoked in the treaty. In this way we get a fully satisfactory explanation of the mentioning of all the Aryan deities named in the Mitani compact, and, so far as I can see, only in this way.

I hope to have made it probable that these gods were Indian and not Aryan or even Iranian. If the conception of the Aśvins as groomsmen belongs to the later phases of the Ṛgveda period, as it seems to do, we must further draw the conclusion that the extension of Indo-Aryan civilization into Mesopotamia took place after the bulk of the Ṛgveda had come into existence. The oldest portions of the collection would consequently have to be considered as considerably older than the Mitani treaty.

We have no means for judging of the character of the expansion of Indian civilization into Mesopotamia in these early times. It may have been the consequence of warlike expeditions or of peaceful penetration. And such scanty information as is available, is in favour of the latter alternative. We know that Indian numerals occur in ancient Hittite texts[1], and it is probable that they have been transmitted through trade and not in consequence of war. So far as we can see, numerals and names of gods are the only Indian words that can be traced in ancient Mesopotamia and Asia Minor, and we shall not probably go wrong in assuming that the pre-historic expansion of Indian civilization into those distant countries was a peaceful propaganda. It is a well-known fact that a similar state of things meets us at all stages of Indian history. India has won its great victories in the world, not in wars or by means of armies, but peacefully through its high ideals and advanced civilization.

[1] Cf. P. Jensen, Indische Zahlwörter in keilschrifthittitischen Texten. SBAW. 1919, pp. 367 f.

DATE DUE

GAYLORD

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

Gaylord
PAMPHLET BINDER
Syracuse, N. Y.
Stockton, Calif.

299.11
K82

Konow, Sten.
AUTHOR

The Aryan Gods of the Mitani
TITLE people.

56350
Date Due

299.11
K82 Konow, Sten.
The Aryan Gods of the
Mitani people.

56350